

SOPHOCLES

AJAX

P. J. FINGLASS

*CAMBRIDGE
CLASSICAL TEXTS AND
COMMENTARIES*

48

CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE

more information – www.cambridge.org/9781107003071

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

This page intentionally left blank

CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL TEXTS
AND COMMENTARIES

EDITORS

J. DIGGLE N. HOPKINSON S. P. OAKLEY
J. G. F. POWELL M. D. REEVE
D. N. SEDLEY R. J. TARRANT

48

SOPHOCLES: AJAX

SOPHOCLES

AJAX

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION,
TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY

BY

P. J. FINGLASS

University of Nottingham



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107003071

© P.J. Finglass 2011

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2011

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Sophocles.

Ajax / Sophocles ; edited with introduction and commentary by P.J. Finglass.
p. cm. – (Cambridge classical texts and commentaries ; 48)

Text in Greek; notes in English.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-00307-1 (hardback)

1. Ajax (Greek mythology) – Drama. I. Finglass, Patrick, 1979– II. Title.

PA4413.A5 2011

882'.01 – dc22 2011008377

ISBN 978-1-107-00307-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

DONALDO RUSSELL
NONAGENARIO

CONTENTS

Preface

page ix

INTRODUCTION	I
1 Date	I
2 Festival	II
3 Production	II
4 Myth	26
5 Heroism	42
6 Unity	51
7 Politics	57
8 Text	59
TEXT AND CRITICAL APPARATUS	71
Index siglorum	72
ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΙΑΣ	77
COMMENTARY	133
Prologue (1–133)	135
Parodos (134–200)	175
First episode, part one (201–347)	202
Kommos (348–429)	238
First episode, part two (430–595)	264
First stasimon (596–645)	313
Second episode (646–92)	328
Second stasimon (693–718)	341
Third episode, part one (719–814)	351
Third episode, part two (815–65)	375
Epiparodos and kommos (866–973)	389
Fourth episode (974–1184)	416
Third stasimon (1185–1222)	469
Exodos (1223–1420)	478

CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY	526
1 Abbreviations: reference works	526
2 Abbreviations: scholars' names	529
3 Abbreviations: standard works on Sophocles	530
4 Editions of Sophocles' <i>Ajax</i>	530
5 Translations of Sophocles' <i>Ajax</i>	532
6 Works cited by author's name	532
7 Works cited by author's name with date	540
 INDEXES	
Index of subjects	591
Index of Greek	605

PREFACE

It is a pleasure to record the assistance which I have received from friends, colleagues, and institutions during my work on this book. First thanks are owed to James Diggle, who read each section of the commentary as soon it was ready. Lyndsay Coe, Michael Reeve, and Martin West read the complete typescript, and Malcolm Davies and Neil Hopkinson substantial sections of it; Scott Scullion and Alan Sommerstein commented on the Introduction and discussion of the staging of Ajax's death.

I am grateful to the staff of the Hallward library in Nottingham, the Bodleian, Sackler, and Taylorian libraries in Oxford, the British, National Art, and Institute of Classical Studies libraries in London, and the Universiteitsbibliotheek in Leiden. The kindness of All Souls College, Oxford, allows me especially easy access to Oxford libraries. Almut Fries, Timothy Janz, and Jo Willmott gave me permission to cite their unpublished DPhil and MPhil theses. David Butterfield, Almut Fries, Ranja Knöbl, Kyriaki Konstantinidou, Helen Lovatt, and Cressida Ryan acquired books and articles for me in Berlin, Cambridge, Göttingen, and Munich. I have received gifts, or extended loans, of books or microfilms from Luigi Battezzato, David Butterfield, Angelos Chaniotis, Christopher Colard, Malcolm Davies, the late Aubrey Morley, Camillo Neri, Stan Owen, Andrea Rodighiero, Donald Russell, Alan Sommerstein, Christopher Stray, Simon Swain, Martin West, Nigel Wilson, Benjamin Wood, and Hugh Wright.

I submitted the typescript of this book to Cambridge University Press on 21 August 2009, three years after I moved to Nottingham and began work on it. I have been able to insert references to work published after that date, but only sporadically. The Syndics approved it on 12 February 2010, at which point the typescript was closed. It has been delightful to work once again with Michael Sharp and Muriel Hall during the production of the book.

PREFACE

I finished this book during a year of leave partly funded by my University, partly by the Arts and Humanities Research Council; the School of Humanities at Nottingham and the British Academy funded two earlier visits to Leiden. The Department of Classics at Nottingham allows scholars time for research in even the busiest of terms. I am grateful to all my colleagues, especially Alan Sommerstein, for providing such a welcoming and stimulating scholarly environment by the banks of the Trent.

P. J. F. F.

Scribebam in urbe Snotengaham

Die Festo Sancti Hilarii, Anno Domini MMXI



Arts & Humanities
Research Council

INTRODUCTION

I DATE

Sophocles was probably born in the early 490s¹ and died in late 406.² Eusebius dates his first production to 470; the Parian Marble puts his first victory in 468.³ An anecdote in Plutarch describes how Cimon and his fellow generals awarded the first prize in 468 to Sophocles, who was producing for the first time.⁴ But since the anecdote contains some fictitious material,⁵ Scullion (2002) 87–90 argues that the detail that Sophocles was competing for the first time could also have been made up, with the intention of making Aeschylus' loss more biting. He argues that Sophocles could have competed in, say, 477 at the age of 19 (assuming a birth year of 496), which may be the age at which Aristophanes first produced a play on his own behalf; Eupolis is said to have competed at seventeen.⁶ If we insist on tragic comparanda, Aeschylus first competed at around twenty-five, Euripides at thirty;⁷ if Sophocles first competed at the same age

¹ Our sources offer the following dates: 498/7 Parian Marble (*TrGF* IV T B 3; he died in 406/5 aged 92), 497/6 Parian Marble (*ibid.* Hc 33; he won his first victory in 469/8 aged 28), 495/4 *Life* (A 1.2), 488–485 *Suda* (A 2).

² References to Sophocles in Aristophanes' *Frogs* indicate that he died shortly before its performance in January 405 (see Dover's edition, pp. 7–9, and Sommerstein's, pp. 20–1). This fits with later sources (Parian Marble (*TrGF* IV T B 3), Hypothesis to *Oedipus Coloneus* (*ibid.* Hc 41), Diodorus Siculus (*ibid.* P 85)) which give the date as 406/5 (i.e. roughly between June 406 and June 405). C. Müller (1995) = (1999b) 196–214 does not convince me that his death occurred in Elaphebolion (i.e. late March/early April) 406.

³ *TrGF* IV T Hc 32ab and 33 respectively.

⁴ Plut. *Cimon* 8.7–8 (*TrGF* IV T Hc 36): πρώτην . . . διδασκαλίαν τοῦ Σοφοκλέους ἔτι νέου καθέντος.

⁵ It states that Aeschylus took umbrage at his loss and went to Sicily, where he died: this was ten years before his victory with the *Oresteia* in 458, and some time after his original visit to Sicily in the 470s.

⁶ See respectively Scullion (2002) 100 and Eupolis test. 1 *PCG*.

⁷ Scullion (2002) 100 n. 55 lists the testimonia.

INTRODUCTION

as Aeschylus, his inaugural tetralogy would have been produced between 473 and 471. Such considerations make Eusebius' date of 470 attractive, but we cannot rule out the possibility of earlier participation. This leaves eight different decades in which the first performance of *Ajax* could fall.

We can begin by ruling out a very early date, since our play requires a skene building. This was in use for Aeschylus' *Oresteia* in 458, but is not required for his *Persae* (472), *Septem* (467), or *Supplices* (470s/460s); hence it was probably introduced some time after 467 and before 458.⁸ Hence *Ajax* cannot be earlier than 466.

More specific datings usually rely on comparisons with the other six surviving tragedies. Of these, only two can be dated with certainty: hypotheses reveal that *Philoctetes* was produced in 409, *Oedipus at Colonus* posthumously in 401. *Electra* must be after 458, the date of Aeschylus' *Choephoroi*; so probably is *Trachiniae*, since it alludes to *Agamemnon* in an apparently meaningful way (see Easterling's commentary, pp. 21–2). We have no fixed point for *Oedipus Rex*.⁹ There are good stylistic grounds for assuming that *Electra* is relatively late (see my edition, p. 1); *Trachiniae* is

⁸ Wilamowitz (1886) 606–13 = (1935–72) I 156–63 first makes this point; see further Taplin (1977) 452–9, Sommerstein (2010b) 17–18.

⁹ Dicaearchus (fr. 80 Wehrli = *TrGF* IV 1 Hd 39) tells us that *Oedipus Rex* was defeated by Philocles. He was competing between 424 and 411, since Aristophanes satirises him during that time (*Vesp.* 461–2, *Av.* 281–3, *Thesm.* 168). His son, the tragedian Morsimus, is satirised between 424 and 406 (*Eg.* 400–1, *Pax* 802, *Ran.* 151). If Morsimus was at least 20, say, in 424, his birth was in 444 or earlier; if his father was twenty at the time of his birth, then Philocles could not have been born later than 464. Since he is competing in 411, we can assume that his birth was no earlier than 500. Moreover, Philocles was the son of Aeschylus' sister. If Aeschylus was born in about 525 (see Sommerstein's Loeb, I p. ix), a sister of his might have been fertile as late as, say, 470, but a date somewhere around 490 would seem more probable. It is thus plausible for Philocles to have been competing as early as the 460s; his career would then be almost coterminous with Sophocles', and so his defeat of *Oedipus Tyrannus* does not help to date the play. (Sommerstein (2010b) 13–14 suggests that Philocles lived c. 480–405 and Morsimus c. 450–400.)

usually thought to be relatively early, and *Oedipus Rex* somewhere in the middle, but I am not aware of a fully-argued statement of the case for either.

The hypothesis to *Antigone*, which is attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium, states that it was the thirty-second play.¹⁰ The list which generated this figure was not alphabetical, but could have been chronological. If so, it suggests a date in the 450s, on the assumption that Sophocles' plays were spaced evenly throughout his career.¹¹ Such an assumption, however, is unsafe if Sophocles' dramatic career followed a similar path to that of Euripides, who seems to have produced proportionately more plays towards the end of his life.¹² Both playwrights were presumably more in demand once their reputations were established; and neither suffered diminution of creative powers in old age. The introduction of dramatic competitions at the Lenaea will have provided the opportunity for more productions than in the playwrights' early years.¹³ The safer assumption seems to

¹⁰ λέλεκται δὲ τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦτο τριακοστὸν δεύτερον (Pearson's edn). Numbers are particularly subject to textual corruption; we must hope that this is accurate.

¹¹ If we assume 123 plays by Sophocles (see Sommerstein (2011)), *Antigone* would date to 453 if Sophocles first competed in 468, or 459 if his first competition was in 477.

¹² Euripides first competed in 455, and died in 407/6. The Alexandrian scholars knew of 92 plays by Euripides; 81 titles have reached us. Of these, we have more or less reliable dates for some 60, of which some 45 come from the last twenty years of his life. Assuming an even distribution of plays we would expect only 38 of the 92 from this period. At least some of the 32 plays without a date are likely to have come from this period too, which amplifies the discrepancy. (This information is most conveniently available in the Loeb by Collard and Cropp, 1 xi-xii, xxix-xxxii. AHS drew my attention to these remarkable figures. MLW suggests that 'because of the growing importance of reading and writing in the later fifth century, playwrights took increasing pains to preserve their texts'.)

¹³ No explicit testimony associates either with this festival. Bergk (1879) 298 speculatively explains the discrepancy between different reckonings of the total number of Sophocles' victories (24 in the *Suda*, 18 in Apollodorus and Diod. Sic. 13.103; see Test. Hg *TrGF*) by assuming that he won six times at the Lenaea.

INTRODUCTION

be that Sophocles did write proportionally more plays as he got older, which would probably mean that *Antigone* dates from the 440s.¹⁴

With this in mind, let us consider how we might date *Ajax* more precisely.

(i) and (ii) *Interlinear hiatus* and *antilabe*. These two stylometric criteria are best considered together. The following table expresses for each play *a* as a percentage of *b*, where *a* is the percentage of all trimeters ending with hiatus which do not end with a pause, and *b* is the percentage of all trimeters which do not end with a pause.¹⁵ ('All trimeters' in the previous sentence excludes trimeters ending with speaker change.)

<i>Tr.</i>	22.1
<i>Ant.</i>	33.6
<i>Aj.</i>	33.6
<i>OR</i>	39.5
<i>El.</i>	40.6
<i>OC</i>	53.9
<i>Phil.</i>	57.7

The data show that a trimeter ending with hiatus in *Trachiniae* is much more likely than other trimeters in that play to

¹⁴ I disregard the story in the hypothesis that Sophocles' generalship in 441/0 was the result of acclaim for *Antigone*. Scullion (2002) 85–6 rightly sees the sentiments expressed in lines 175–7 (cited by Dem. 19.246–8 as a model of statesmanlike expression) as the reason for the association of the play with this episode in the poet's life.

¹⁵ Figures are from Stinton (1990) 367, a corrected version of *id.* (1977c) 71. Harrison (1941) and (1943) first notes the phenomenon; Stinton (1977c) 68–70 = (1990) 364–6 refines his methodology. Harrison and Stinton use Pearson's edition for their calculations; textual changes since his edition will have altered the figures slightly, though not enough to make them unreliable. The figure for *Trachiniae*, however, may be even less than that given by Stinton, since several of its instances of interlinear hiatus without pause are plausible candidates for emendation on other grounds (see Davies's commentary, pp. 270–2; in the third line of p. 270, for 'more' read 'less'). See Battezzato (2001) = (2008) 103–38 for further discussion and modification of Stinton's approach.

be followed by a pause. Elsewhere, this tendency is less pronounced. In other words, Sophocles is strict in accompanying most instances of interlinear hiatus in *Trachiniae* with a syntactic pause between the trimeters, so that the clash of vowels is mollified.

The second table gives figures for *antilabe*, or occurrence of speaker change in spoken iambic trimeters at any point except at the end of the trimeter. In the first column I give the number of instances of *antilabe* in a play, then the total number of speaker changes, then the former expressed as a percentage of the latter.¹⁶

<i>Ant.</i>	0	222	0.0
<i>Tr.</i>	2	199	1.0
<i>OR</i>	10	378	2.6
<i>Aj.</i>	8	214	3.7
<i>El.</i>	16	295	5.4
<i>Phil.</i>	37	325	11.4
<i>OC</i>	44	340	12.9

A similar pattern emerges in both tables. The two highest numbers, by some distance, belong to the two latest plays (although the highest figure for interlinear hiatus goes to the second-last play), while *Antigone*, which is probably forty or fifty years older, has a considerably lower figure. *Electra*, usually taken to be the third latest play on stylistic grounds, has the third highest figure each time; *Trachiniae*, often taken to be an early play, is ranked lowest and second-lowest. There is no obvious literary reason why Sophocles should have chosen to admit interlinear hiatus without pause more freely in some plays than in others. Rather, these data arise from a slow change of compositional

¹⁶ Figures are my own, from my own editions for *Aj.* and *El.*, and Ll-J/W's text for the rest. I include only spoken trimeters, not lyric trimeters or any tetrameters. I do not include *extra metrum* exclamations when totalling speaker changes. I count speaker changes, not trimeters containing speaker changes: so *Phil.* 753 contains four changes of speaker, of which three are counted as instances of *antilabe*.

INTRODUCTION

style. *Antilabe*, by contrast, is used as a literary device, generally to convey excitement or agitation. But since all seven plays contain copious amounts of such emotion, divergences in the quantity of *antilabe* cannot be put down to the different qualities of the individual dramas. They too must rather reflect the unconscious development of Sophocles' stylistic practice.¹⁷

The limited data suggest that Sophocles made more use of both hiatus and *antilabe* over time.¹⁸ But we do not have enough fixed points to establish whether these were relatively gradual changes,¹⁹ or subject to sudden lurches in either direction. The latter seems more plausible, seeing that the pairs *Trachiniae*/*Antigone*, *Ajax*/*Oedipus Rex*, and *Philoctetes*/*Oedipus Coloneus* appear in different orders in the two lists, and the difference in each of these pairs for the *antilabe* figures is statistically trivial. This makes it harder to use the data to set parameters on an individual drama such as *Ajax*. We can be fairly confident that it was not one of Sophocles' last plays: say, not after 420. A more precise dating would require us to decide whether to give greater weight to the data involving hiatus (which suggest an early play) or *antilabe* (pointing to a somewhat later date). I am inclined to prefer the former. The smaller amount of *antilabe* in *Oedipus Rex* compared with *Ajax*, as a proportion of all speaker change found in trimeters (*OR* has 33 changes of speaker for every hundred trimeters, *Aj.* only 22), reflects the greater density of speaker

¹⁷ Kitto (1939) 178–83 (approved by Stinton (1977c) 72 = (1990) 368) attacks the use of *antilabe* as a criterion for dating. Believing that it is a stylistic device aimed at creating particular kinds of dramatic excitement (p. 179), he argues that a drama employing fewer of these kinds of excitement will have fewer *antilabai*. But Kitto's putative taxonomy of excitement, according to which certain sorts of emotion merit *antilabe*, and some not, involves special pleading. For example, he argues that while *Antigone* does contain 'dramatic excitement' (p. 180), it is not 'sharp or palpitating' enough to merit this stylistic feature.

¹⁸ Wolff p. 137 first pointed this out for *antilabe*.

¹⁹ Cf. resolution rates in the Euripidean trimeter, on which see my *Electra*, p. 2 n. 2.

change in the trimeters of the former play.²⁰ So even though *OR* has more instances of *antilabe* than *Aj.*, the comparative rarity of speaker change in the latter (caused by the greater number of long speeches and monologues) ensures that its percentage figure is lower. Moreover, *OR* arguably shows greater maturity in its handling of *antilabe*, since it is found there not just in blocks (626–9, 1173–6), as in *Ajax* (591–4, 981–5), but also in single lines (676, 1120).²¹

I tentatively conclude that figures for hiatus, not those for *antilabe*, give the more reliable information for *Ajax*; and that these indicate a fairly early play, perhaps from roughly the same time as *Antigone*. The absence of *antilabe* from *Antigone*, and its near absence from *Trachiniae*, suggest that these plays are earlier than *Ajax*. But the data will not bear much weight, and it remains possible that *Ajax* is earliest of the three.

(iii) The form of the parodos, recited choral anapaests followed by choral lyric, is paralleled by Aeschylus' *Persae* (472), *Supplices* (470s/460s: see Scullion (2002) 90–101), and *Agamemnon* (458), but nowhere else in Sophocles. The nearest parallel occurs in the *Antigone* parodos, which interweaves lyric and anapaestic stanzas. This might have been a feature of earlier tragedy.²²

(iv) The transitional choral anapaests at 1163–7 can be paralleled four times in Aeschylus, and, approximately, by a passage in *Antigone* (n.), which may suggest an early feature.²³ Euripides uses it in 431 in *Med.* 759–63, however, so caution is in order. Was

²⁰ My calculations are based on the Oxford Classical Text for each play, accepting the deletions printed there, but without supplying lines where a lacuna is marked.

²¹ Individual lines of *antilabe* are also found at *Tr.* 409, 418, and so do not on their own indicate a later date. But the combination of both in the same play (as in *El.*, *Phil.*, and *OC*) may be significant.

²² Schneidewin² p. 29 first identifies the significance of the phenomenon; Campbell makes the comparison with *Antigone* (11 6; cf. 1 452).

²³ Wolff³ p. 137 first notes this.

INTRODUCTION

this an archaism on Euripides' part, or did the feature remain in regular use in the 430s?

(v) Also relevant may be the use of the third actor, a device first attested in the *Oresteia* in 458.²⁴ In *Agamemnon*, no scene contains three speaking actors (three are on stage at 783–974, but Cassandra is mute); in *Choephoroi*, one scene requires a third actor (where Pylades, elsewhere played by a mute, speaks at 900–2); *Eumenides* requires three actors for the trial scene (566–777), but there is no 'three-cornered' dialogue. All Sophocles' plays have at least one scene with three actors, but three characters engage in conversation only in *OR*, *El.*, *Phil.*, and *OC*. Hence the tentative hypothesis that *Aj.*, *Ant.*, and *Tr.* represent an earlier stage in the use of this technique, and so were written before the other four.²⁵

That is not to argue that the handling of the third actor was unsophisticated, in either Aeschylus²⁶ or the three Sophoclean plays identified above. In the opening scene of *Ajax*, for example, Athena interacts first with Odysseus, then Ajax, then Odysseus. There is no 'three-cornered' interaction, but there are good reasons for that in terms of plot (any interaction between Ajax and Odysseus would have been at the point of a sword) and dramatic technique (Athena's different treatment of the two men is striking; so too is Odysseus' later reaction to the dialogue which he witnesses). Similarly effective refusals to engage in 'three-cornered' dialogue are found in *Antigone* and *Trachiniae*.²⁷

²⁴ According to Arist. *Poet.* 1449a18–19, Sophocles was responsible for introducing the third actor. This is probably an inference from the introduction of the third actor during the period that both Sophocles and Aeschylus were competing (cf. A. Brown (1984) 15 n. 21). (The deletion of this passage by Else (1939), (1957) 166–8, 174–9, approved by Brown (1984) 1–8, seems insufficiently motivated.)

²⁵ Schneidewin² p. 29 first makes the point; cf. Heinz (1937) 273–7, Schwinge (1962) 73–5.

²⁶ Knox (1972) 107–24 = (1979) 41–52 demonstrates Aeschylus' skill in handling the device in the first two plays of the *Oresteia*.

²⁷ Cf. Griffith on *Ant.* 526–81 ('Ismene engages separately with both Ant<igone> and Kreon, while direct interaction between Ant<igone>

Nevertheless, it is remarkable that these three plays all exploit the absence of contact between a trio of actors, but show no interest in the possibilities offered by three-cornered dialogue which are exploited by the other four.

Moreover, there is perhaps a place in *Ajax* where the absence of three-cornered dialogue is unusual on strictly literary grounds. Odysseus enters at 1316, but the conversation is between him and Agamemnon until the latter's exit at 1373; Teucer and Odysseus speak only when Agamemnon is gone. Agamemnon's desire to ignore Teucer is understandable. Odysseus' is less so, since he sets out to be polite to both sides; he may be represented as focussing his attention on the person whose mind he needs to change. But Teucer's silence cannot be so readily explained on the basis of character: elsewhere he is never slow to speak. My subjective response is that Sophocles would have handled this scene differently later in his career.²⁸ If I am right, the absence of three-cornered dialogue here is not the result of a carefully chosen policy, but a reflex of the default mode of composition for such scenes at this period.

(vi) Other chronological criteria are not helpful and merit only brief mention. The prominence of epic vocabulary is no indication of an early date: such lexical choices are adequately motivated by the subject matter. The frequency of resolutions, so important for the dating of Euripides' works, does not yield useful data for Sophocles.²⁹ Attempts to tie the production of *Ajax* to historical events or personalities are arbitrary.³⁰ Other

and Kreon is pointedly avoided') and Davies's *Trachiniae* commentary, p. xviii n. 4.

²⁸ Cf. Listmann (1910) 22–3. Contrast *Phil.* 539–627, where the False Merchant delivers a message to Neoptolemus when the latter is in conversation with Philoctetes. The scene begins with discussion between the former pair, but soon Philoctetes forces his way into the conversation (578–9, 622–5).

²⁹ See Scullion (2002) 91.

³⁰ Some would date the play to the Peloponnesian War (431–404), or the years leading up to it, on the ground that the scene with Menelaus displays anti-Spartan feeling (see Stanford p. 294 n. 1, who lists and refutes supporters of

INTRODUCTION

scholars have seen allusions to literary works of the fifth century, none of which convinces.³¹ A lekythos from c. 460 is taken by some to show the influence of *Ajax*,³² but this supposes a naïve view of the relationship between drama and the visual arts.³³ General considerations of literary quality are better avoided, too, as excessively subjective.³⁴

All criteria with weight suggest that *Ajax* is a fairly early drama, and some tie it more closely to *Antigone* than to any other play; the criterion provided by interlinear hiatus suggests a gap between these two plays and *Trachiniae*. I would tentatively put *Ajax* with *Antigone* in the 440s. A date in the early to mid 430s or very late

this view). Others claim that 1260–1 presuppose the Periclean citizenship law of 450/1 (see n.). Attempts to see *Ajax* as a reflection of different fifth-century politicians recall the allegorical interpretations of Pindar so popular in the nineteenth century, and not entirely abandoned today (see my edition of Pindar's *Pythian Eleven*, pp. 38–9). Cf. Easterling, *Trachiniae* commentary, p. 23: 'The attempts so far made to link *Trachiniae* with contemporary events have not carried conviction, relying as they do on wholly arbitrary methods of analysis.' Griffin (1999b) 83–9 refutes other attempts to allegorise *Ajax* in a political direction.

³¹ Stanford p. 294 n. 3 and Garvie pp. 6–7 provide a list.

³² Thus tentatively Schefold (1976) 74 and the scholars mentioned by Garvie p. 7 n. 22.

³³ It also ignores the same iconography on an askos from c. 490–480, now lost: see p. 30 below.

³⁴ Lloyd-Jones writes (Loeb, 1 p. 9): 'To me *Ajax* seems to be a mature masterpiece, probably not much earlier than *Oedipus Tyrannus*', and conjectures that both plays belong to the 430s or 420s. But why should it have taken Sophocles so long to reach artistic maturity? For Winnington-Ingram (1980) 341, 'there is no good ground for supposing that any of the extant plays belongs to the earliest period of his work'. If he means that all the surviving plays are too well crafted to be very early, the career of Aristophanes undermines his underlying assumption. Moreover, Sophocles' defeat of Aeschylus in 468 indicates that at least three, and probably at least four, of the ten judges ranked some of his earliest work above that of the old master. (For the permutations of the voting system, which make it possible for a victor to receive a minority of the votes cast, see Marshall and Van Willigenburg (2004) 102.) The supposed description by Sophocles of the development of his own style recorded by Plutarch, sometimes mentioned in discussions of the chronology of his plays, tells us more about Plutarch than Sophocles (see Pelling (2007)).

3 PRODUCTION

450s cannot be ruled out. Any later would probably be too far from *Antigone*, any earlier, too close to *Trachiniae*.³⁵

2 FESTIVAL

We do not know which festival saw the first performance of *Ajax*. Assuming that it took place in Attica, the possibilities are:

- (i) The Dionysia, held each year in Elaphebolion (late March/early April). This, the leading dramatic festival, is the most likely option.
- (ii) The Lenaea, held each year in Gamelion (January).³⁶
- (iii) The local rural Dionysia, held in various demes during Poseideion (December).³⁷

3 PRODUCTION

(A) SETTING THE SCENE

At the opening the scene is set at Ajax's encampment, on the outer edge of the territory settled by the Greek army (3–4). One eisodos (which I label A) leads to the rest of the Greek camp, while the other (B) leads away from it, into regions of the

³⁵ Strictly speaking, these are dates of composition, not performance. It is conceivable that Sophocles could have produced this, or any, drama some considerable time after writing it.

³⁶ We do not know when tragedy was first performed at the Lenaea. Comedy was performed there from at least c. 440 (*IG* II-III² 2325 with Csapo and Slater (1994) 133–4, Olson's edition of comic fragments, pp. 386–8), tragedy from at least 420 (*IG* II-III² 2319 with Csapo and Slater (1994) 136). The law cited at Dem. 21.10 mentions various festivals in chronological order, and refers to 'comedy and tragedy' at the Dionysia, but 'tragedy and comedy' at the Lenaea. If this reflects the order of performance at each festival, and if the more important, and longer established, genre is placed second in each case, then tragedy at the Lenaea would not predate the 430s (cf. MacDowell (1995) 9–11), which is probably too late for *Ajax*. But the evidence does not allow us to establish this beyond reasonable doubt. Drama at the Lenaea was probably performed at the theatre of Dionysus on the Acropolis (cf. MacDowell (1995) 7–8).

³⁷ See Csapo (2004) 61–2 for the involvement of tragedians at this festival.

INTRODUCTION

Troad where Greeks are not permanently stationed.³⁸ The skene building, with its central door, represents Ajax's hut. At line 815 the scene shifts to an unidentified place in the wilderness, the 'untrodden spot' where Ajax goes to hide his sword (657–9).³⁹ The skene now represents a grove (892).⁴⁰ Eisodos A still leads to the Greek camp, eisodos B to Ajax's hut. Many scholars locate the new scene on the sea-shore (654–6), failing to notice that this is the earlier of two prospective destinations. The scene change is not marked by a change of scenery; any decoration of the skene is generic and not specific to a particular location. Rather, having previously been informed of Ajax's destination, the audience, on seeing him again, will assume that the scene is now set at that place.⁴¹ Ajax's initial emphasis on the recent planting of his sword in the earth (815–22) strengthens this assumption: he said he would do this at the 'untrodden spot' (657–9), even if the significance of that promise was not fully apparent then. Moreover, since Ajax enters from the skene, which up to this point represents his hut, and yet has had no opportunity to re-enter that building since his departure at 692, a change of scene is the only possible explanation.

Such changes of scene are rare but not unprecedented. Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (458 BC) provides a parallel; beginning in Apollo's temple at Delphi, it shifts at line 235 to the temple of Athena Polias at Athens.⁴² His *Aitnaiai* (produced in Sicily

³⁸ Thus e.g. Blume (2004a) 113, H/OK (2007) 364.

³⁹ Thus Σ 815a (p. 185 Chr.) ἐπὶ ἐρήμῳ τινὸς χωρίου.

⁴⁰ Cf. Taplin (1977) 455, A. Brown (1984) 10.

⁴¹ Thus Gardiner (1979) 12. The departure of the chorus at 814 is a necessary condition for the change of scene (cf. Aeschylus' *Eumenides*), but not a sufficient one (cf. Euripides' *Alceste* and *Helen*, and the pseudo-Euripidean *Rhesus*, with Scullion (1994) 114 and n. 101; L. Parker on *Alc.* 746 argues tentatively for the continuing presence of the chorus on stage in that play, however).

⁴² I accept the argument of Scullion (1994) 77–86 that the scene at Athens is set throughout at the same location, and does not shift to the Areopagus at 566.

in 476/5) involves multiple locations, as a papyrus hypothesis reveals: Aitna, Xuthia, Aitna again, Leontini, Syracuse, and a location obscured by damage to the papyrus.⁴³ Earlier in the same papyrus there is probably a reference to the change of scene in *Eumenides*, followed by a mention of Sophocles' satyr-play *Achilleos Erastai*; we may infer that Sophocles' drama also involved a scene-change.⁴⁴ Even if we discount *Achilleos Erastai* as a satyr-play, and *Aithaiai* because it was produced in Sicily, that still leaves *Eumenides*.

Some scholars argue that the play begins with decorated panels attached to the skene depicting Ajax's hut; between 814 and 815, stagehands replace them with new ones representing the wilderness. This idea is doubly problematic.⁴⁵ (i) Stagehands walking on in the middle of the play, breaking the dramatic illusion, would constitute an 'unparalleled anomaly' in Greek drama.⁴⁶ Nor would this be a brief procedure; even with a substantial team, it would have taken several minutes to substitute the new backdrop. What would the audience have made of this? Moreover, under this reconstruction Ajax's entry at 815 would not, as is dramatically desirable, follow swiftly upon the frantic, but belated, departure of his would-be protectors at 814. (ii) Aristotle attributes the invention of σκηνογραφία to Sophocles,⁴⁷ but the verdict of recent scholarship is that any such scene-painting

⁴³ Radt, *TrGF* III pp. 126–7; see further Poli-Palladini (2001) 290–6.

⁴⁴ Radt, *TrGF* IV pp. 165–6; thus Fraenkel *ap.* Lobel (1952) 66.

⁴⁵ Purgold (1802) 43 damns it as 'a tragoediae cothurno et gravitate alienissimum'.

⁴⁶ Thus Scullion (1994) 115; cf. A. Brown (1984) 10–11. Stagehands are not required for the scene-change in *Eumenides*. I accept the argument of Scullion (1994) 80 with n. 33 that the βρέτας of Athena, which Orestes grips (242–3), and which was not present in the preceding scene at Delphi, lies at the entrance of the skene ready for Orestes after he enters from an eisodos.

⁴⁷ *Poetics* 1449a18 (≈ Csapo and Slater (1994) 99), deleted by Else (n. 24). Vitruvius (7 Praef. 11 ≈ Csapo and Slater (1994) 273) gives a different account of the invention, attributing it to Agatharchus, a painter working under Aeschylus (see Christensen (1999)).

INTRODUCTION

was not intended to represent specific backgrounds for individual dramas.⁴⁸ It would have been quite a task to do this for all four plays of a tetralogy.

In the most important contribution of modern times to this debate, Scullion (1994) 109–28 argues that the scene does not change.⁴⁹ He bases his case on the play itself, correctly arguing that the two scholia which assert that the scene changes have no evidential value for fifth-century performance practice.⁵⁰ His argument is as follows.

(i) He objects to the use of the Deception Speech (646–92) as evidence for the change of scene: ‘it would be a very confident spectator indeed who would conclude that Aias will probably not do what he claims but must certainly go to the places where he says he will do it. If he does conclude this he can imagine Aias proceeding to the shore, but cannot know the locality of the next stage, only that Aias will be alone and unseen there’ (p. 113). The single reference to a change of scene is in any case ‘a far cry from the elaborate signposting of *Eumenides*’

⁴⁸ See P. Arnott (1962) 93–6, A. Brown (1984) 8–14, Kuntz (1993) 159–61, Wiles (1997) 161, Beer (2004) 26–9 (ingeniously suggesting that by σκηνογραφία Aristotle means Sophocles’ special ability to evoke a picture of a locality by means of words), Blume (2004b). So Allan, in his edition of Euripides’ *Helen*, p. 30: ‘In *Helen* the *skênê* represents the palace of Theoclymenus . . . <but> it is unlikely that the stage-building was decorated to resemble such a palace.’ Such specific decoration would, he notes, necessitate the changing of panels from one play to the other, and ‘it is surprising that such physical (as opposed to purely verbal) scene-setting is not exploited for ludicrous effect in Old Comedy’.

⁴⁹ He believes that there was a grove to the side of the skene with access to the backstage area, and Ajax reappears there to kill himself; for his staging of the suicide, see 815–65n. Scullion first sets out his case in his PhD thesis of 1990. A variant on this idea, proposed by Purgold (1802) 42–5, is discussed below. Scullion’s position is accepted by H/OK (2007), with an important modification, discussed below, and by Raeburn in his translation (pp. 67–8, 72 n. 8, 273).

⁵⁰ Σ 813 (p. 185 Chr.) μετακινεῖται ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ χοροῦ ἐξεληθόντος. ἀναγκαῖα δὲ ἡ ἔξοδος, ἵνα εὖρηται καὶ ὁ Αἴας διαχειρίσασθαι ἑαυτὸν and 815 μετακινεῖται ἡ σκηνὴ ἐπὶ ἐρήμῳ τινὲς χωρίου.

(p. 113; cf. pp. 110–11). This is the keystone of Scullion's case: a change of scene requires clear highlighting on the part of the playwright, and such highlighting is absent from our play.

(ii) The two semichoruses have completed their search when they reappear at 866: the whole of the western side has been investigated (874), as has the eastern (877–8). 'The only natural conclusion is that they have been away searching the shorelines assigned them and returned thence, disappointed, to the front of the tent, the natural place to reassemble' (p. 118).

(iii) *πάραυλος* in 892 (which qualifies *βοή*, the shout of Tecmessa as she discovers the body) means not 'nearby' but 'beside the hut' (pp. 118–19). He points to *OC* 785 *ὡς πάραυλον οἰκίσης*, where the term is used of Oedipus dwelling on the border with Thebes, and Eur. *Ion* 493–4, where again the related verb *παρὰυλίζω* is accompanied by a reference to a 'fixed physical entity'; the sense 'nearby' lacks such specification. He also cites 796 *σκηνῆς ὕπαυλον* ('inside the hut') and *Phil.* 157–8 *τίν' ἔχει στίβον, | ἔνυλον ἢ θυραῖον*; ('What place does he occupy, inside the cave, or outside?') in support of the thesis that 'in Sophoklean usage of similar compounds the prepositional element predominates'.

(iv) Since Ajax's 'hopes for decent treatment of his body and his son are focused on the arrival of Teukros' (p. 122; cf. 560–4, 687–9, 825–30), it makes sense for him to kill himself by his hut, where Teucer will be most likely to find him.

(v) Teucer's wish that anyone who drags Eurysaces away from Ajax's corpse should be 'cast out from the land unburied' (1177), his warning to Agamemnon that if he 'casts out' Ajax's body, he will have to 'cast out' three further bodies (1308–9), and Odysseus' plea to Agamemnon not to 'cast out' Ajax's body unburied (1332–3), only make sense if the corpse is in front of the hut: 'what point would there be in casting Aias's body from one remote place to another, casting it not out but *further* out?' (p. 124).

INTRODUCTION

My reply to these points is as follows:

(i) The fundamental characteristic of the Deception Speech is not outright mendacity, but equivocating language which is intended to deceive (646–92n.). If Ajax returns to the hut, his words at 654–60 become an outright lie. But if there is a change of scene, his words fit the pattern of deceptive ambiguity: Ajax indeed goes to an untrodden place to hide his sword in the earth, but only as a preparation for his suicide.

(ii) When the audience see the two halves of the chorus enter at 866–72, they will assume that their search is still in progress: Ajax has so far eluded them, and their need to find him is urgent. The chorus's song at 879/80–890 confirms this assumption, for three reasons. (a) Their appeal for news of Ajax's whereabouts from a variety of putative informants would be pointless if they had abandoned their search. (b) The naming of Mount Olympus and the Bosphorus suggests that the search is to be widened, not brought to a halt. (c) The tone of weary complaint in 887/8–890 suits a group whose toils are in progress; compare the present tense in 866. If I am right and the chorus have not stopped looking for Ajax, they cannot have returned to the hut, since that would be a definitively closural action announcing the end of their search.

(iii) Compounds formed from αὐλή, 'dwelling place', sometimes retain the sense of a permanent place of habitation; but they need not. πάραυλος at fr. 503.2 *TrGF* is used of a fish which spends only part of the year in the Hellespont. ξύναυλος, literally 'having one's dwelling with', means just 'being with' (*sc.* his flocks) at *OR* 1126, when it is used of a shepherd of no fixed abode. Compare how ξυνοικεῖ suggests a persistent accompaniment of something unpleasant (*El.* 599–600n.), rather than something literally 'living with' the subject. Moreover, in the passages which Scullion cites (*OC* 785, Eur. *Ion* 493–4), the noun qualified by πάραυλος/παρὰυλίζουσα is conceived of as having its dwelling (αὐλή) nearby (παρά); but in *Aj.* 892, according to Scullion, the shout comes from nearby (παρά) a dwelling (αὐλή), a usage for which no parallels are cited.

3 PRODUCTION

(iv) Ajax is aware that a search will be made for him, and that sooner or later someone will find him; he prays that Teucer will be that person. Such a prayer could be delivered at any location, and so cannot be used in evidence either way. But it seems perhaps more suitable for delivery in the ‘untrodden spot’ than at the hut. If he kills himself at the hut, Ajax can presume that Teucer will get to him first, since that is where he will return from his mission. His corpse is more vulnerable in an ‘untrodden spot’; hence his request for divine assistance.

(v) If we accept a change of scene, Ajax’s body is indeed in a lonely spot, but no one has ‘cast it out’ there: he himself chose this place for his suicide. Menelaus imagines ‘casting out’ the body on the shore (1064–5), which would be a particular humiliation: denied the partial protection and obscurity afforded by the grove, Ajax’s corpse would lie, unburied and maltreated, for all to see.

I see three additional problems in Scullion’s thesis; he anticipates and offers a defence against the first two.

(vi) Why should Ajax return to the hut? As Sommerstein points out, ‘he [could not] have known in advance that Tecmessa and the chorus, warned by a messenger that he had deceived them, would depart from the camp in search of him, thus conveniently leaving the area clear for him to return to’; consequently, if he does return, ‘we would have to put him down as a fool whose careful plan to deceive his friends and evade their efforts to save him depended for its success on a flukish coincidence’.⁵¹ Scullion answers this by saying ‘no audience seems to me likely to question such a powerful *coup de théâtre* as the scene on this view represents . . . Their reaction to Aias’s reappearance in this

⁵¹ Sommerstein (2010a) 46. Lobeck¹ on 814 (p. 352) first raises this objection: ‘num in mediis castris, num in ipso amicorum conspectu mori voluit Ajax, ut in eum rediret locum, unde eos discessisse minime probabile esset?’ H/OK (2007) 372 call this part of Scullion’s thesis ‘inexplicable’, despite accepting much of the rest of his case. We might add that he orders Tecmessa inside the hut during the Deception Speech (684–6), which is strange if he was planning to return there to kill himself.

INTRODUCTION

way is likely simply to be a surprised realisation that he hasn't gone away at all. The spectator, if the question even occurs to him, will perhaps suppose that from a vantage-point just off-stage Aias can see that his tent has been deserted, and can step out into the light to take his farewell' (p. 121). But I know of no parallel for such an irrational entry. The alleged vantage-point is no solution to this problem, for three reasons. (a) Ajax has no cause to suppose that his companions will come searching for him, and hence no reason to occupy a vantage-point. (b) There is no mention of a vantage-point. (c) The idea conjures up a demeaning picture of the protagonist, peering out from behind a tree until his friends are gone.

(vii) Soon after Teucer arrives at 974, he asks the chorus where Eurysaces is (983–4). Their reply, *μόνος παρὰ σκηναῖσιν* ('alone, by the huts', 985), implies that Teucer and the chorus are not currently at the huts.⁵² Any doubt about that would be resolved by the urgency and alarm of Teucer's reply (985–9, beginning in *antilabe*); his distress is explicable only if Eurysaces and Teucer are in different locations. The distance between the grove and Ajax's encampment, a few metres at most, is insufficient motivation for the outburst (*pace* Scullion (1994) 123–4). Scullion rightly comments 'the emphasis is on the fact that he is alone, and it is to this that Teukros really responds, in fear for his safety'; but if Teucer is at the huts, and Eurysaces is beside the huts, then Eurysaces is hardly 'alone'.⁵³

(viii) Finally, there is the argument from silence. If Ajax returns to the hut to kill himself, we might have expected Tecmessa and

⁵² Thus Lobeck² on 813 (p. 361): 'Neque Eurysaces v 983. [our 985] dici potuit *μόνος παρὰ σκηναῖσι*, si chorus, qui hoc dicit, ipse omnesque qui adsunt, apud tentoria versantur, ubi antea fuerant.' H/OK (2007) 374 follow him, claiming that 985 'implies that the huts are not immediately to hand'.

⁵³ In their discussion of this passage H/OK (2007) 374 n. 36 claim that Eurysaces is 'brought to him from where he is being kept safe in the camp', ignoring *μόνος*. Any attendants still at the hut do not count, since they are in no position to protect him.

the chorus to refer to this during their lengthy lamentations and self-reproaches which follow their discovery of his body: ‘we went astray in searching for him – and yet he was here all the time’, or the like. Arguments from silence should be treated with caution, but can be illuminating; Scullion (2003) 393 provides an especially effective one.

An older variant on Scullion’s hypothesis is the idea that the skene has two doors: one representing the entrance to Ajax’s hut, the other a grove.⁵⁴ Ajax’s appearance from the latter at 815 is supposed to represent the change of scene. But ‘it is difficult to understand how the audience will conceive the scene to have shifted any further than the distance between the two sections of the skene’ (Scullion (1994) 116). Moreover, no other tragedy certainly requires more than one door. The sole possible exception is Aeschylus’ *Choephoroi*, and even there the two doors would both be leading into the palace, not representing locations at some distance from each other.⁵⁵

H/OK (2007) acknowledge difficulties (vi) and (vii), and have Ajax returning not to his hut, but to a grove at the side of the skene, which is in ‘the wilderness beyond the camp’, while simultaneously ‘close to his followers’ encampment’ (p. 372). But how close? Let us assume that the grove (which H/OK place in front of one of the additional doors with which they equip the tragic skene) was ten metres away from the main door representing the entrance to Ajax’s hut. For their argument to work, H/OK must assume that those ten metres represent a much greater distance in the world of the play: for if it is inexplicable for Ajax to return to his hut, his appearance just

⁵⁴ References at Scullion (1994) 115–16. H/OK (2007) 364, 372 put a representation of a grove in front of the additional skene door, which is thus invisible to the audience; this amounts to the same thing. Pickard-Cambridge (1946) 49 assumes that Ajax’s suicide takes place in a grove at the side of the skene, but is unsure whether it is there from the beginning of the play (and ignored until that point), or whether stagehands bring on painted panels at the change of scene.

⁵⁵ See Garvie’s commentary, pp. xlvii–lii.

INTRODUCTION

a few paces away would similarly defy explanation. Such an arrangement is open to the following objections:

(i) I know of no parallel for such ‘stretching’ of space on the Greek tragic stage, with one metre on stage representing anything other than one metre in the world of the play.

(ii) Even if another case of ‘stretching’ exists, it may well be hard to compare to our case. H/OK posit, on the other side of the main door, and presumably the same distance away, a third door, representing a separate hut in Ajax’s encampment, which is ‘in earshot’ of the stage in front of the main door (p. 368), and therefore presumably as far away from the main hut as it appears to be. Hence H/OK must posit that to one side of the main door, one metre equals one metre of space in the world of the play; whereas to the other side, a single metre might represent, say, at least ten metres. This makes considerable demands on the audience.

(iii) H/OK argue (p. 366) that the play opens with Athena addressing Odysseus from the grove as he circles outside Ajax’s hut, and comes out to meet him. Unless her voice is Stentorian, and her stride Homeric, this is not consistent with a grove in a different location. Similar problems arise when Tecmessa and her attendants carry the body from the grove into the *orchestra* (p. 373).

(B) ENTRANCES AND EXITS

Ajax contains numerous entrances and exits: ‘more than in any other Sophoclean or Aeschylean play’ (Gardiner (1987) 73). For ease of reference I set out my preferred account below,⁵⁶ and discuss controversial cases in the commentary.

Part 1 (1–814): Ajax’s hut.

Before 1 Odysseus enters from eisodos A.

1 Athena enters from eisodos A.

⁵⁶ Ley (1988) 88–95 presents a different schedule.

3 PRODUCTION

- 91 Ajax enters from the skene.
 117 Ajax leaves via the skene.
 133 Athena and Odysseus leave via eisodos A.
 134 The chorus enter from eisodos A.
 201 Tecmessa enters from the skene, with attendants.
 348 Ajax enters from the skene on the ekkyklema.
 541–5 Eurysaces enters from eisodos A, brought by an attendant.
 595 Ajax leaves via the skene on the ekkyklema.
 646 Ajax enters from the skene.
 686 Tecmessa and Eurysaces leave via the skene.
 692 Ajax leaves via eisodos B.
 719 The Messenger enters from eisodos A.
 787 Tecmessa enters from the skene, with attendants.
 814 The chorus divide into two and leave via separate eisodoi. The Messenger leaves via eisodos A, Tecmessa via eisodos B with attendants.

Part 2: An unidentified place in the wilderness, in front of a grove.

- 815 Ajax enters from the skene.
 865 Ajax leaves via the skene.
 866 The two halves of the chorus enter from separate eisodoi, one slightly ahead of the other.
 891 Tecmessa appears in the doorway of the skene.
 925/6–936 Tecmessa briefly disappears behind the skene to cover Ajax's body. She then accompanies her attendants as they carry it out of the skene.
 974–7 Teucer enters from eisodos A, with at least one attendant.
 989 Tecmessa leaves via eisodos B, with attendants.
 1040–7 Menelaus enters from eisodos A, with attendants.
 1160 Menelaus leaves via eisodos A, with attendants.
 1168 Tecmessa and Eurysaces enter from eisodos B, with attendants.
 1184 Teucer leaves via eisodos A.

INTRODUCTION

1223	Teucer enters from eisodos A; Agamemnon is seen approaching from the same direction, with attendants.
1226	Agamemnon arrives on stage, with attendants.
1316	Odysseus enters from eisodos A.
1373	Agamemnon leaves via eisodos A, with attendants.
1401	Odysseus leaves via eisodos A.
1420	Teucer, Tecmessa (with attendants), and Eurysaces leave via eisodos A, carrying the body of Ajax. Part of the chorus leave via each eisodos.

(C) PART DIVISION

Eight parts were distributed between the three actors. I list them below, accompanied by the number of lines which belongs to each,⁵⁷ and the sections of the play during which they appear on stage.

Ajax	282	91–117, 348–595, 646–92, 815–65
Tecmessa	202	201–686, 787–814, 891–989 ⁵⁸
Teucer	198	974–1184, 1223–1420
Odysseus	83	1–133, 1316–1401
Athena	75	1–133
Messenger	67	719–814
Menelaus	62	1040–1160
Agamemnon	60	1223–1373

The same actor cannot play characters appearing together, or with simultaneous or near-simultaneous entrances and

⁵⁷ I draw these figures from my text, taking an iambic trimeter, an anapaestic dimeter, a lyric 'line' as printed in my text, and an exclamation to represent a single line for this purpose. Lyric 'lines' are generally shorter than trimeters, but arguably the extra demands made on a singing actor compensate for this. Only Ajax sings; Tecmessa and Teucer deliver recited anapaests.

⁵⁸ A mute plays Tecmessa from 1168.

3 PRODUCTION

exits. In the table below a single ‘x’ marks an impossible combination.

	Aj	Tec	Teu	Od	Ath	Mess	Men	Ag
Aj		x		x	x	x		
Tec	x		x			x		
Teu		x		x			x	x
Od	x		x		x			x
Ath	x			x				
Mess	x	x						
Men			x					
Ag			x	x				

Several different distributions are available; and we do not know the principles used to prefer one to another. Three possibilities are as follows:

(i) Each actor had roughly the same number of lines. Since the play contains 1029, an equitable distribution would give each actor 343. That can be almost exactly realised, thus:

Ajax, Agamemnon (342)

Odysseus, Tecmessa, Menelaus (347)

Athena, Messenger, Teucer (340)⁵⁹

Note also that ‘Tecmessa’s exit at 989 before Menelaus’ entrance at 1040 looks like just the interval needed for the Tecmessa-actor to recostume as Menelaus’ (JSS).

⁵⁹ I avoid calling the three actors πρωταγωνιστής, δευτεραγωνιστής, and τριταγωνιστής, since we cannot be sure that these names were in use in this period, and they imply a hierarchy among the actors which may not have existed then. Cf. Marshall (2003) 259 and (for their earliest attestations) Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 132–5.

INTRODUCTION

(ii) One actor had a starring role, and the other two split the remainder equally:⁶⁰

Ajax, Teucer (480 lines, or 47%)

Odysseus, Tecmessa (285)

Athena, the Messenger, Menelaus, Agamemnon (264)

(iii) The same actor, who had a higher-pitched voice, played both the female parts:⁶¹

Ajax, Teucer (480)

Athena, Tecmessa, Agamemnon (337)

Odysseus, the Messenger, Menelaus (212)

Our preference depends in part on the view that we take of the acting profession in this period. In 449 the Athenians instituted a prize for the best actor at the Dionysia,⁶² which implies that individual actors were becoming well known as early as the 450s (thus Easterling (2002) 327). To what extent did that development encourage would-be stars to take on as big a part as possible? We cannot tell, and so must leave the question of part division open.

Other criteria are available, such as the principles of family resemblance and thematic significance,⁶³ according to which blood relations, or thematically parallel or antithetical roles, are played by the same actor wherever possible. Such patterning would have been perceptible through the actors' voices rather than their appearance, since they were wearing masks. Blood relationship is an objective criterion, and, if employed by

⁶⁰ This arrangement is put forward by K. Müller (1838) 1103 = (1847–8) 1306, although he does not mention the Messenger.

⁶¹ Cf. West's edition of Euripides' *Orestes*, p. 38. MLW notes that such a principle cannot have applied in every play, since in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* Clytemnestra and Cassandra are played by different actors. My preferred distribution of parts for *Electra* gives each of the actors at least one female part (p. 12).

⁶² *TGF* I DID A 1 67–70 ≈ Csapo and Slater (1994) 226.

⁶³ I use the helpful terminology of Marshall (1994) 54–5.

3 PRODUCTION

Sophocles, would favour arrangement (ii) over (i) above. Thematic significance is more subjective; it does not require much ingenuity to designate almost any pair of characters as 'parallel' or 'antithetical'. So in arrangement (i) above, Ajax and Agamemnon could be 'antithetical', whereas in (ii), Ajax and Teucer are presumably 'parallel'. Such a broadly-applicable criterion is of limited heuristic value. I also wonder if it is illuminating to consider characters in this manner. It seems too schematic to do justice to the complex relationships which Greek tragedy typically portrays.

Mute characters played Tecmessa (from 1168), attendants, and Eurysaces. The last named required a boy less than ten years old (since he was conceived after the start of the war), small enough to be lifted up to Ajax on the ekkyklema (545), but big enough to assist with the lifting of Ajax's corpse at the end. Perhaps the child was about eight.

According to the ancient *Life of Sophocles* (ch. 4), Sophocles increased the number of chorus members from twelve to fifteen. We do not know if this is true (Taplin (1977) 323 n. 3 suggests that the number was always fifteen), or, if it is, whether the change took place before the first performance of *Ajax*. If fifteen is correct, the chorus splits into unequal groups of eight and seven at 814; I have called these 'halves' in the commentary.

(D) AUDIENCE REACTION

Libanius provides a testimonium for the audience's reaction to the original performance. In a passage describing how the Athenians are especially given to mercy (πρὸς ἔλεον ἑτοιμοί), he cites various examples before going on τὸ δὲ ἔτι μείζον, ἄλωσις μὲν πόλεως ἐν δράματι θρηνοῦντα τὸν δῆμον ἔδειξεν. Αἴας δὲ ἀποστερούμενος παρὰ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ ταφῆς ταῦτά ποιεῖ (*Decl.* 14.22 = VI 99.13–100.1 Foerster). The former play mentioned is Phrynichus' *Capture of Miletus*, for which Libanius' source will have been Hdt. 6.21.2. It is not impossible that his reference to *Ajax* also relied on earlier testimony; more likely it is apocryphal.

INTRODUCTION

4 MYTH

To understand the impact of Sophocles' play, we need to investigate earlier presentations of Ajax's story. In what follows I have focussed on the events surrounding his suicide, but I include references to the rest of his career where relevant.

(A) THE TRADITION

(i) Both *Homeric poems* feature Ajax, one before, one after his death. The mighty warrior of the *Iliad* helps to hold off the Trojans during the Greeks' long retreat in books 11 to 16 (1272–9n.), often accompanied by his half-brother, the archer Teucer. He fights a formal duel with Hector in book 7 (1283–7n.), at the end of which he gives his opponent his belt in return for Hector's sword (661–3n.). Hector compliments him on his wisdom as well as his brawn (119–20n.), a judgment borne out by his major contribution to the Embassy to Achilles.⁶⁴

In the *Odyssey* Odysseus encounters Ajax's ghost in the Underworld. The other shades stand round Odysseus, asking after their relatives:

οἷη δ' Αἴαντος ψυχὴ Τελαμωνιάδαο
νόσφιν ἀφεστήκει, κεχολωμένη εἵνεκα νίκης,
τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ νίκησα δικάζόμενος παρὰ νηυσὶ
τεύχεσιν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλλῆος· ἔθηκε δὲ πότνια μήτηρ.
παῖδες δὲ Τρώων δίκασαν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.
(11.543–7)⁶⁵

Odysseus wishes that he had not won, and describes Ajax as second only to Achilles in appearance and mighty deeds. But despite his conciliatory words, Ajax's shade refuses to reply and walks away.

⁶⁴ See further Jebb's edition, pp. ix–xii, Kullmann (1960) 79–80.

⁶⁵ The last line was suspected by Aristarchus, probably on account of his belief that Homer, who predated the Cycle, could not mention myths which were demonstrably Cyclic (thus Van der Valk (1949) 237–8).

The brief description is the first reference to the Judgment of the Arms of Achilles. The award evidently involved a judicial process, with Thetis setting out the prize (and presiding?); how the ‘children of the Trojans and Pallas Athena’ arrived at their verdict is unspecified. Since this detail is consistent with the account in the *Little Iliad* (see (ii) below), both poems were probably drawing on the same source; alternatively, the later work drew upon and expanded the brief reference found in the former.

(ii) Two of the poems of the *Epic Cycle* describe Ajax’s suicide.⁶⁶ In the *Aethiopis* Ajax lifts the body of Achilles and carries it back to the ships, while Odysseus fights off the Trojans (p. 112 and fr. 3). After the funeral games for Achilles, a quarrel (στάσις) develops between Ajax and Odysseus over the Arms (p. 112), which, we infer, is followed by the Judgment; Ajax kills himself towards dawn (fr. 6, περὶ τὸν ὄρθρον).⁶⁷ The *Little Iliad* begins with the Judgment of the Arms. To distinguish between the claimants, Nestor advises the Greeks to send some of their number below the walls of Troy to eavesdrop on the Trojans’ discussion of their valour.⁶⁸ They hear two girls discussing the warriors. One praises Ajax for carrying the body out of the fighting,⁶⁹ the other, ‘by the foresight of Athena’ (Ἀθηνᾶς προνοίᾳ), responds with astonishment, pointing out that even a woman could carry a load, but she could not fight (i.e. as Odysseus did).⁷⁰ Odysseus

⁶⁶ Although these poems took on the forms familiar to the classical period after the composition of the *Iliad*, they incorporate pre-Homeric material, which may include their handling of the *Ajax* myth. In this section, bare page and fragment numbers refer to West’s edition (*GEF*).

⁶⁷ Proclus’ plot summary ends with the στάσις, but the poem could hardly have finished at such an inconclusive moment. Proclus abbreviates the end of the *Aethiopis* because the *Little Iliad*, the next poem in the Cycle, begins with the same events, and he presumably wishes to avoid repetition in his summary (p. 12).

⁶⁸ This story may also lie behind the participation of the ‘children of the Trojans’ in the decision, as mentioned in the *Odyssey*.

⁶⁹ Αἴας μὲν γὰρ ἔειρε καὶ ἔκφερε δηϊοτῆτος | ἥρω Πηλεΐδην, οὐδ’ ἤθελε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, fr. 2.

⁷⁰ πῶς ἐπεφωνήσω; πῶς οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἔειπες; . . . καὶ κε γυνὴ φέροι ἄχθος, ἔπει κεν ἀνὴρ ἀναθείη, | ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἂν μαχέσαιοτο, fr. 2.

is victorious in accordance with Athena's will; Ajax goes mad, destroys the spoil of the Greeks, and kills himself.⁷¹ He was not cremated according to the usual custom, but buried in a coffin, because of Agamemnon's wrath.⁷²

Ajax is already dead by the time of the events of the *Iliu Persis*, but one fragment relates to his story: a description of the doctor Podalirius states that he was 'first to recognise Ajax's flashing eyes and burdened spirit'.⁷³ This could reflect simply anger, but the emphasis on the eyes,⁷⁴ and the ascription of the recognition to a doctor, suggests that madness is at issue, as in the *Little Iliad*.

(iii) Ajax is amply represented in *archaic and classical art*.⁷⁵ His duel with Hector is depicted on Attic and Corinthian ware;⁷⁶ he also appears numerous times carrying the body of Achilles out of the mêlée.⁷⁷ A particularly frequent scene in Attic art shows him playing a board game with Achilles during a lull in the fighting.⁷⁸ But his suicide is also prominent. From the beginning of the seventh century, images show his corpse, face down, supported on his hands and knees, with his sword piercing his middle.⁷⁹

⁷¹ ἡ τῶν ὀπλῶν κρίσις γίνεται καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς κατὰ βούλησιν Ἀθηναίᾳ λαμβάνει. Αἴας δ' ἐμμανὴς γενόμενος τήν τε λείαν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν λυμαίνεται καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖ (p. 120).

⁷² ὁ τήν Μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα γράψας ἱστορεῖ μὴδὲ καυθῆναι συνήθως τὸν Αἴαντα, τεθῆναι δὲ οὕτως ἐν σορῶ διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ βασιλέως, fr. 3.

⁷³ ὅς ῥα καὶ Αἴαντος πρῶτος μάθε χωμένοιο | ὄμματά τ' ἀστράπτοντα βαρυνόμενόν τε νόημα, fr. 2.7–8.

⁷⁴ Cf. Papadopoulou (2005) 63 with n. 16, Harries (1891) 18–20.

⁷⁵ In this section, '§X' means 'item X in Touchefeu (1981)'.

⁷⁶ §§33–8, 43; see Simon (2003) 8–10.

⁷⁷ Kossatz-Deissmann (1981) 185–93 lists and discusses the images; the earliest are from the later eighth and early seventh centuries. The scene is especially common in Attic black-figure, occurring only twice in red-figure. See further Burgess (2001) 185, Padgett (2001) 15 n. 17, Simon (2003) 11–15, Kowalzig (2006) 87–8.

⁷⁸ See Kossatz-Deissmann (1981) 96–103, Hedreen (2001) 91–104; the images, in black and red figure, date between c. 540 and 480, with one from 430/20.

⁷⁹ Thus a Protocorinthian aryballos, 700–675 (§118); bronze mould, perhaps Corinthian, c. 650 (§125). Jenkins (2002) argues that Ajax is depicted in a bronze statuette from the last quarter of the eighth century (British Museum GR 1865.11–18.230), depicting a sitting man about to plunge a dagger into

This picture remains common in archaic art,⁸⁰ often with his hands covering the head in a gesture of shame, and survives into the classical period.⁸¹ The aftermath of the suicide also receives early portrayals. A Corinthian krater from *c.* 600 (§120) shows two armed warriors confronting each other over Ajax's body. An expanded version of this iconography appears on a Corinthian kylix from *c.* 580 (§122), where a whole series of Greek leaders (Nestor, Phoenix, Agamemnon, Odysseus, Diomedes, Teucer, lesser Ajax), some carrying spears, stand on either side of the corpse.

Beginning in the mid-sixth century, Attic art depicts not Ajax's corpse, but the period immediately before his suicide: 'the moments before death, the ennobling drama and not the dirty deed, become the iconic focus' (Golder (1992) 349). A black-figure amphora by Exekias shows Ajax placing his sword in the ground, where he has heaped up a small pile of supporting earth; lines on his brow bring out his anxiety.⁸² On the left is a palm tree, on the right his helmet, shield, and spears. Mackay

himself. But the act of suicide is not sufficient to establish a connexion. See also Simon (2003) 17 n. 55.

⁸⁰ Gem, second half of 7th c., inscribed HAHIFAΣ (§110); Corinthian aryballos, *c.* 600 BC (§121); Corinthian krater, *c.* 600, inscribed AIFAΣ (§120); Corinthian lekythos from Thebes, 600–575, inscribed AIFAΣ (§119); Corinthian kylix, Cavalcade Painter, *c.* 580, inscribed AIFAΣ (§122); Spartan ivory comb, 580–570 (§126); Corinthian aryballos, *c.* 575–550 (§123); metope from Temple of Hera at Foce del Sele, mid-6th c. (§128, on which see Zancani Montuoro (1964) 70–6; for the date, see my edition of Pindar's *Pythian Eleven*, p. 89); terracotta altar, *c.* 530 (§129). The image is also found on several archaic shield-bands from Olympia (§127; Brommer (1971–6) III 15). Cf. Golder (1992) 348 ('in iconic terms, Ajax in death is a bestial figure, face-down, stretched forward, haunches raised slightly and on all fours'), Simon (2003) 16–18.

⁸¹ An Etruscan oenochoe attributed to the Micali painter (5th c., §115, M. I. Davies (1973) 64 with figure 1) shows Ajax pierced through, not touching the ground. Etruscan scarabs show Ajax at the moment of piercing (5th c., §111) or about to be pierced (*c.* 480, §112).

⁸² §104; *c.* 540. See Beazley (1986) 64, Simon (2003) 18–19, Toohey (2004) 171–2. The Foce del Sele metope (n. 80) also depicts earth heaped up around the sword.

(2002) 66–8 argues that these replace the bystanders who often look in on the central scene in black figure, and thus emphasise the loneliness of the warrior.

A slightly later moment, after the fixing of the sword but before the suicide, is captured on two red-figure vases from the first half of the fifth century. On an askos Ajax kneels, naked, arms outstretched, his sword pointing upwards on the right, his helmet, shield, and scabbard to his left. The same scene appears on an Attic lekythos:⁸³ Ajax's mouth is open, his shield is leaning on a pillar, above which his scabbard is hanging,⁸⁴ and his erect sword has no visible means of support. As with Exekias' picture, the loneliness of the warrior is apparent (cf. Scheffold (1976) 73). Such loneliness is mitigated in a contemporary scene which shows a young woman in the act of covering the body of a man impaled face up on a sword, identified very probably with Tecmessa and Ajax.⁸⁵ Fragments of a kylix by Onesimos⁸⁶ show a woman moving towards a horizontal body; the other scene on the vase (see below) confirms that this comes from the Ajax myth.

The art of this period also takes an interest in the event which led to the suicide: the Judgment of the Arms. A unique iconographical type on an Attic pelike from 520–490 (§80) shows Odysseus speaking on a platform, Ajax listening to him (both are named), and the Arms on the ground between them. Early fifth-century Athenian red-figure pottery frequently depicts the voting.⁸⁷ As the Greek chiefs, in civilian garb, deposit their

⁸³ §106 (490–480, now lost) and §105 (c. 460).

⁸⁴ 'The hero's empty scabbard, conveniently hung by its baldric from the upper border above the pillar... suggests... the deliberate preparations for the impending suicide' (M. I. Davies (1985) 84).

⁸⁵ Tondo of a kylix by the Brygos Painter, 500–475 (§140), on which see M. I. Davies (1973) and (for the identification) Finglass (2009a) 279–80 n. 28. Ajax might be lying on 'a pebble strewn shore' with sand supporting the hilt (thus D. Williams (1980) 140).

⁸⁶ Louvre C 11335; c. 500–480. See D. Williams (1980) 137–8, Sparkes (1985) 27–8 with 38 n. 72.

⁸⁷ §§81–6; listed by Spivey (1994) 41–7.

voting pebbles, Athena frequently presides over the process in the centre, sometimes with Odysseus by her side. Ajax stands on the right edge, often with his head in his hand in a gesture of despair. Such images may appear on vases additionally depicting the quarrel between Ajax and Odysseus;⁸⁸ the juxtaposition implies the settlement of disputes by the peaceful act of voting, and is plausibly connected with the early years of the democracy.⁸⁹

A single representation survives of the animals killed by Ajax in his madness, on the kylix by Onesimus mentioned above. Above a bull on its back stand at least two men; one appears to be pointing down with his finger or thumb. This apparently depicts the moment when Ajax's crime was discovered. Putting it on the same vase as the discovery of Ajax's body by Tecmessa (see above) suggests a causal relationship.⁹⁰

(iv) *Pindar* discusses Ajax's suicide three times:⁹¹

(a) The narrator of *Nemean* 7, in support of his proposition that most men have a 'blind heart' (τυφλὸν . . . ῥτορ, 23–4), cites Ajax; if they could recognise the truth, he would never have committed suicide in anger over the Arms (οὐ κεν ὄπλων χολωθείς | ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν | λευρὸν ξίφος, 25–7). The narrator has just claimed that the account of Odysseus given by the poetry of Homer is more impressive than his actual sufferings (20–1). The two rivals are paratactically compared:

⁸⁸ §§71–3. This corresponds to the στάσις mentioned in the *Aethiopis*. Other possible depictions of this quarrel from the seventh and sixth centuries from Attica, and one from Melos (§§74–8), are uncertain.

⁸⁹ Thus Spivey (1994) 49–50. A. Steiner (2007) 120–1 presents three images from the same red-figure kylix, painted by Douris (§81; c. 480–470): the initial quarrel, the voting, and Odysseus giving the Arms to Neoptolemus (for this last identification see D. Williams (1980) 139 with n. 16a).

⁹⁰ See D. Williams (1980) 138.

⁹¹ None of the relevant odes can be dated, even relatively. Pindar's first dated composition is from 498, his last from 446. Hence some or all of the odes could be later than *Ajax*, although it is more likely that one (probably all) predates the play. Some of the phrases in my translations are influenced by Race's Loeb.

INTRODUCTION

the one excessively exalted by posterity, the other insufficiently valued by his peers.

(b) In *Nemean* 8 a reference to how envy targets only ἐσλοί (157n.) is exemplified by Ajax's suicide (21–3). His story shows how, in a dispute, oblivion overwhelms the man who is not eloquent (ἀγλωσσον) but courageous (ἥτορ... ἄλκιμον, 24): the lying Odysseus is granted the Arms through the 'secret votes' of the Greeks (κρυφαίαισι γὰρ ἐν ψάφοις Ὀδυσσῆ Δαναοὶ θεράπευσαν, 26), and the defeated Ajax kills himself (27). This is despite Ajax's receiving more wounds than Odysseus, both during the fighting over Achilles' body and in the rest of the conflict; such is the power of deceit to glorify the undeserving (28–34).

(c) The maxim that the skill (τέχνα) of lesser men can bring down a greater introduces the account of Ajax's suicide in *Isthmian* 4 (34–5). This took place 'late at night' (ὀψίτ | ἐν νυκτί, 35b–36), and by his action Ajax 'cast blame on all the sons of Greeks who went to Troy' (μομφὰν ἔχει | παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν, 36–36b). But thanks to Homer, who has 'set straight his entire achievement' (πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετάν, 38), he is renowned among later generations.

Although the emphasis varies according to immediate rhetorical requirements, the fundamental idea that Ajax is cheated of the Arms, unattested before Pindar, is common to all three odes. Less favourable elements are suppressed. 'There is no mention of his madness, no mention of his attack on the Greek leaders or his killing of the flocks, no mention of Athena's hostility. In Pindar, Ajax's story is simply one of a noble man cheated of his rights and committing suicide from righteous indignation' (March (1991–3) 4). The positive presentation of Ajax in *N.* 7 and 8 is connected with his status as an Aeacid, since those odes are written for victors from Aegina, home of his grandfather (644–5n.).

The only other substantial reference to Ajax in Pindar appears at *I.* 6.35–56 (also for an Aeginetan victor), where Heracles prophesies his birth to his father Telamon and describes his formidable character (430–1n.).

(v) Three plays by *Aeschylus* treat the story of Ajax and his family: *Hoplon Krisis* (fr. 174–8 *TrGF*), *Threissai* (fr. 83–5), and *Salaminiai* (fr. 216–20). Scholars generally accept the suggestion of Welcker (1824) 438–40 that they form a connected trilogy.

Hoplon Krisis ('The Judgment of the Arms') features Thetis (fr. 174), presumably presenting Achilles' arms for the contest, as in the *Odyssey*. An attack on Odysseus' paternity is probably delivered by Ajax;⁹² a claim that 'the words of truth are simple' may also belong to him, 'contrasting his plain honesty with the tricky oratory of Odysseus',⁹³ as may an exclamatory question about the pointlessness of a life of pain,⁹⁴ in which case it presumably comes from the fall-out to the Judgment.

In *Threissai* (a play named after its chorus of Thracian slave-women) Ajax commits suicide, news of which is announced by a messenger (testimonium, *TrGF* III p. 205). At first he was unable to dispatch himself, since his sword kept bending 'like a man drawing a bow' (τόξον ὥς τις ἐντείνων, fr. 83) against his skin; but a goddess then appeared (. . . τις παροῦσα δαίμων in the paraphrase) to indicate his weak point.⁹⁵ The warrior's near-total invulnerability is a motif in myth and folk-tale;⁹⁶ in other accounts, and perhaps in this play, Ajax's miraculous endowment was the result of being enfolded as an infant in Heracles' lion-skin.⁹⁷ A lyric fragment which declares that 'his habits were

⁹² Fr. 175 (188–90n.); thus Martinus (1605) 99 recto.

⁹³ Fr. 176 ἀπλᾶ γὰρ ἐστί τῆς ἀληθείας ἔπιη; thus Sommerstein, III 177, following Bothe, his edition, p. 802.

⁹⁴ Fr. 177 (473–4n.); thus Bothe, *ibid.*

⁹⁵ Sommerstein, III 100, reconstructs three full lines *exempli gratia* on the basis of the paraphrase.

⁹⁶ See West (2007) 444–6 for Indo-European parallels.

⁹⁷ Berthold (1911) 6–16. For bibliography on this fragment see M. I. Davies (1985) 89 n. 28. Ajax's invulnerability is elsewhere attested at Pl. *Symp.* 219e and Antisthenes fr. 15.7 Caizzi (Odysseus to Ajax) ὅπλα ἔχεις ἄρρηκτα καὶ ἄτρωτα, δὲ ἅπερ σέ φασιν ἄτρωτον εἶναι. Lycophron first explicitly links it with the lion-skin (455–61, 464–5), perhaps influenced by Pind. *I.* 6.37–56 (or Pindar's account may reflect this myth, which he suppresses for whatever reason).

INTRODUCTION

blameless, fond of music, fond of the symposium' might come from praise of Ajax after his death.⁹⁸

No evidence remains for the contents of *Salaminiai*. Scholars since Welcker have assumed that the 'Salaminian Women' in question were witnesses to Teucer's return to Salamis without his brother, and his consequent banishment by his father Telamon.

Aesch. fr. dub. 451q contains a fragmentary description of the Judgment of the Arms and the death of Ajax. Some scholars attribute it to this trilogy,⁹⁹ but the summary style of the account suggests that Ajax's story is being narrated in a different context.¹⁰⁰

(vi) *Ajax* was not the only treatment of this myth by *Sophocles*. Osann (1820) 39–41 conjectures that his *Teucer* described the expulsion of the eponymous protagonist from Salamis by his angry father Telamon; Welcker (1839–41) 1 191–7 adds his consequent removal to Cyprus, where he founds a new settlement named after his homeland. From the exiguous fragments we know that Telamon learns of Ajax's death either before or during the drama (fr. 577, cited 1010–11n.). He is consoled by Oileus, father of the lesser Ajax; in his turn, Oileus learns of the death of his son.¹⁰¹ The storm described in fr. 578 could belong to one of three voyages: Teucer's to Salamis or Cyprus, or the lesser Ajax's from Troy. The last is perhaps most likely, since his death occurred during a storm.¹⁰² If fr. 579a belongs to the play, Odysseus was a character; but the ascription is uncertain, based as it is on Aristotle's referring to events happening 'in

⁹⁸ Fr. 84a τρόποι δ' ἀμεμφεῖς, φιλόμουσοι, φιλοσυμπόται; translation and attribution by Sommerstein, III 103.

⁹⁹ Most recently Garriga (2006) places the fragment in *Salaminiai*; in his Loeb (III. 341) Sommerstein makes the same suggestion, but prints it in a section entitled 'Probably Aeschylean papyrus fragments'.

¹⁰⁰ See *TrGF* III p. 482.

¹⁰¹ Fr. 576, if correctly ascribed; see *TrGF* IV 431 and Lloyd-Jones's Loeb, III 289, which I follow.

¹⁰² Hom. *Od.* 4.499–510, *Iliu Persis* p. 146 *GEF*, *Nostoi* p. 154 *GEF*.

Teucer without specifying an author.¹⁰³ The play was performed before 423, since part of fr. 578 is repeated at Ar. *Nub.* 583, a line which comes from the original production of that play (Dover's edition, p. lxxxi). Only one word survives of a further play on a subject connected with Ajax, *Eurysaces* (fr. 223).

Could *Ajax*, *Teucer*, and *Eurysaces* have formed a connected trilogy?¹⁰⁴ The sole evidence for connected trilogies by Sophocles is a fourth-century deme inscription¹⁰⁵ which records choregic victories by two demesmen, whether at home or at Athens; one of these victories occurred when Σοφοκλῆς ἐδίδασκε Τηλέφειαν.¹⁰⁶ The -εια suffix can only refer to a group of plays.¹⁰⁷ The inscription mentions four playwrights in all: the comic dramatists Euphantides and Cratinus (both 5th c.), followed by the tragedians Timotheus (unknown) and Sophocles. If this is a chronological list, the placing of the reference to Sophocles at the end is consistent with the hypothesis that the Sophocles in question was our Sophocles' homonymous grandson,¹⁰⁸ who won twelve victories, including at the Dionysia in 387 and 375 (*TrGF* I 62). Furthermore, whichever Sophocles wrote the Τηλέφεια, it need not have had a continuous plot like Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, but could have relied on thematic connexion.¹⁰⁹

Even if we accept that Sophocles wrote connected trilogies, there is *prima facie* evidence that he did not in this case. The vivid and lengthy depiction of Teucer's banishment at 1008–21,

¹⁰³ Pace H/OK (2007) 380, for whom the ascription is a 'fact' which 'we know'.

¹⁰⁴ Osann (1820) 8, 35–45 posits a trilogy *Hoplōn Krisis* (unattested for Sophocles), *Ajax*, *Teucer*, with a satyr-play called *Salamis*. Schöll (1839) 520–669 alters this to *Ajax*, *Teucer*, and *Eurysaces*, a suggestion taken up by Wolff pp. 138–9 (cf. 136–7) and H/OK (2007) 378–80.

¹⁰⁵ From Halae Aeonides or Aexone (see Eliot (1962) 29–30).

¹⁰⁶ *TrGF* I DIB B 5.8 = *TrGF* IV p. 434; cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 54–6, Radt (1983) 208 = (2002) 280 = Hofmann (1991) 96, Csapo and Slater (1994) 44.

¹⁰⁷ See Sienkewicz (1976) 109–10 with n. 5, Sommerstein on Ar. *Ran.* 1124.

¹⁰⁸ Thus Snell, *TrGF* I 17 and Luppe (1974); cf. Taplin and Radt *ap. de Romilly* (1983) 225.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. M. Wright (2006) 27–8.

INTRODUCTION

which goes into considerable detail concerning Telamon's likely mood, words, and actions, would be out of place if the old man appeared in the next play and behaved as his son imagines, perhaps less than an hour after these words are spoken.¹¹⁰ The level of detail, both factual and emotional, goes beyond 'foreshadowing' (as H/OK (2007) 380 call it). It is so similar to what probably happened in *Teucer* that the audience is unlikely to have taken kindly to being presented with the same material twice in one sitting.

(vii) There are a handful of *other possible fifth-century treatments* of the myths associated with Ajax, some of which could be post-classical. Two fragments survive of a *Teucer* by Ion of Chios (*TrGF* 19 FF 34–5); the former could refer to the arrival of the exiles on Cyprus. Timotheus of Miletus was victorious (presumably in a dithyrambic competition) with an *Αἶας ἐμμανής* (fr. 777 *PMG* = Hordern). A musical papyrus (from after AD 156) contains four lines from a lament for the dead Ajax written for the female voice (*DAGM* §17); stylistic grounds indicate a classical or early Hellenistic date, although Timotheus is probably not the author (see Hordern's edition, p. 100).

Two anonymous tragic fragments are probably from plays dealing with Ajax's story: Tr. Adesp. fr. 110 (Ajax lamenting his dishonour) and 683a *TrGF* (the chorus on his death). They may well come from after the fifth century.

(B) SOPHOCLES' VERSION

Epic, lyric, tragedy, and the visual arts all treated the story of Ajax's death before Sophocles. But no previous literary account

¹¹⁰ Thus Benloew (1839) 6: 'adventus . . . Teucris, altercatio cum patre, exsulatio impendens vividius depicta sunt, quam ut sine taedio, etiam explicite enarrata relegantur.' He contrasts Aesch. *Ag.* 1280 ἥξει γὰρ ἡμῶν ἄλλος αὖ τιμάορος κτλ., where Cassandra's prophetic account of Orestes' vengeance, the subject of the next play of the trilogy, is vaguer than *Teucer*.

devoted to this story has survived complete. The kind of detailed, scene by scene comparison with earlier works possible in the case of, say, his *Electra*, is denied us for *Ajax*. Nevertheless, it is possible to hypothesise about Sophocles' creative interaction with the myth and his original contributions to it, in terms of content and presentation. All the following suggestions should be treated with caution. The fragmentary nature of the material makes it probable that at least some aspects of the myth for which our play provides the earliest evidence were anticipated in earlier works now lost or fragmentary. I treat events and topics in approximately the order in which they first appear in the play.

(i) Athena's hostility to Ajax is not explicitly mentioned elsewhere, but her involvement in the contest is found as early as the *Odyssey* and *Little Iliad*, and she is prominent on images of the voting scenes. We may guess that originally her interest was in supporting Odysseus rather than harming Ajax; we do not know if Sophocles was the first to have Ajax incur the goddess's wrath through arrogance (762–77). Perhaps (as MLW suggests) her enmity was influenced by her hostility to the other, 'lesser' Ajax (Hom. *Od.* 4.502).

(ii) Sophocles' play never describes in detail the contest for the Arms or the Judgment, despite their fundamental importance for the plot. The organisation of the contest remains unspecified; it involved voting (1136), but by whom (all the Greeks? the chiefs?), and under what presiding officers (Agamemnon? Athena?), is unknown. The accusations of malpractice made by Ajax (445–9n.) and Teucer (1135–7n.) are vague and vigorously contested by Menelaus. Ajax never goes beyond general self-assertion (421–6) and denigration of Odysseus (379–82) to explain why he should have won. His rescue of the body of Achilles, for example, which strengthens his case in the *Aethiopis*, and which is frequently depicted in archaic art, goes unmentioned (contrast Antisthenes fr. 14.2 Caizzi). Towards the end Teucer brings up two of his achievements, the defence of the

INTRODUCTION

ships and the duel with Hector (1272–89), but only to justify his claim to burial, not to attack the original verdict. The exchange of sword and belt after the duel is mentioned earlier, but only in expressions of regret for Hector's ill-fated gift (661–3, 817–18, 1024–7).

Aeschylus' *Hoplon Krisis*, by contrast, will have dealt with this part of the story, as its title suggests; since Ajax does not kill himself until the second drama of the trilogy, the Judgment must have taken up the major part of the opening play. It may have included a ballot, as D. Williams (1980) 142 suggests, whether on stage (cf. the *Oresteia*) or off (cf. *Supplices*). Sophocles thus puts in the background an element of the story which Aeschylus had highlighted. This is partly for the sake of variety: Sophocles often pays less attention to aspects of a myth treated in depth by Aeschylus, and vice versa (see my *Electra*, pp. 5–6). But there is a more specific purpose. Sophocles' Ajax regards his greatness as self-evident. He does not list his achievements, or deign to specify arguments explaining his superiority. Similarly with the allegations of corruption: since he knows he should have won, a contrary verdict is proof, for him, of unfair play. Detailed explanation would merely limit the extent of his vast self-assertion.

(iii) Ajax's attempted attack on the Greeks is unattested before Sophocles. If it is a Sophoclean innovation, the playwright 'has sprung on his audience a more extreme and more starkly problematic Ajax than any they had previously known' (H/OK (2007) 366), and the audience would be as surprised as Odysseus when he learns of this (44–50). But it may well have occurred in the *Little Iliad*. His attack there on the cattle is the consequence of madness; while this could simply be an action undertaken at random by a frantic man, the reference to insanity (rather than rage) may suggest faulty perception, and thus intended assassination. (Cf. perhaps the *Iliu Persis* fragment, where Ajax's madness is first evident in his eyes.) Agamemnon's anger at Ajax, expressed in the grievous sanction of denying him cremation, may also be more comprehensible if Ajax attempted some harm

to the army (especially its leaders) beyond a maddened attack on the spoil.

We cannot tell if Aeschylus' Ajax tried to attack his fellow Greeks. If not, and if the Ajax of the *Little Iliad* did, Sophocles would be reaching back to an epic precedent ignored by his tragic predecessor (cf. my *Electra*, pp. 7–8).

(iv) Sophocles' Ajax kills himself during the day, after a foiled attack on the army at night-time. In the *Aethiopis* his death takes place towards dawn; in Pindar (*I.* 4.35b–36) it occurs 'late at night'. Certainly the hours of darkness offer a macabre backdrop for the suicide. Our sources for the *Little Iliad* do not specify times, but it is hard to imagine the attack on the cattle not taking place at night. The day-time death in Sophocles results from an aspect of plotting which may be original, if it is not anticipated in Aeschylus' *Threissai*. The attack is still nocturnal, but Ajax returns to sanity afterwards, and kills himself later that day. In this lengthy intervening period he is forced to confront his ruin and hear the pleas of his kin, and expresses his emotions with terrible clarity. This, the kernel of Sophocles' tragedy, may have led him to change the time of the suicide.

(v) Sophocles allows his audience to watch Ajax's last moments alive, even if the actual blow is delivered off stage (815–65n.). There were parallels for this in epic and art, but it had not previously been attempted in drama: in *Threissai* Aeschylus has the death described by a narrator. The emotional immediacy of Sophocles' arrangement made this an attractive change. Moreover, Sophocles does not invest Ajax with the partial invulnerability attributed to him in Aeschylus. Such a detail, irrelevant in itself (it does not matter where the sword enters Ajax's body), would detract from Ajax's previous status as a mighty warrior.¹¹¹

Both Sophocles and some vase painters consider Ajax's state immediately before the suicide. The fixing of the sword in

¹¹¹ Cf. Griffin (1977) 40 = Cairns (2001) 368 on the absence of invulnerable warriors in Homer.

INTRODUCTION

the earth, on which Sophocles' Ajax lays such emphasis, is memorably depicted by Exekias; the soil heaped up around the sword in the picture corresponds to Sophocles' εὔ περι-στειλᾶς (821). Both Exekias and Sophocles show Ajax taking obvious care in this last ordinary but dreadful action; but whereas Exekias emphasises his anxiety by the lines on his brow, Sophocles' Ajax feels an almost workmanlike pride in the sturdiness of his arrangement (815–23). Exekias' palm tree may be connected with the grove in which Sophocles' Ajax kills himself. The askoi from the early fifth century, showing Ajax in prayer after securing his sword, are tantalising: what did viewers think he was saying? All three graphic depictions stress the loneliness of the scene, something of great importance in the drama too. But Sophocles' account differs from these depictions in certain respects: his Ajax does not deliver his final speech kneeling, nor does he have his armour with him when he dies.

The fifth-century Etruscan oenochoe attributed to the Micali painter (§115), where Ajax's arms and legs are not touching the ground as he is pierced by the sword, may suggest his 'swift leap' on the sword (833–4; thus Touchefeu (1981) 330).

(vi) The Brygos kylix (500–475) showing a woman covering Ajax's corpse, and probably the kylix by Onesimus (c. 500–480), prefigure the actions of Sophocles' Tecmessa (915–16n.).

(vii) The denial of burial to Ajax is not attested elsewhere. In the *Little Iliad* Agamemnon in anger withholds cremation, and has Ajax buried, in defiance of epic custom.¹¹² Both versions deny the corpse its expected treatment as a mark of dishonour. Sophocles' punishment is the more severe; at least in the epic Ajax's body would be protected from animal predation (1064–5; cf. H/OK (2007) 372–3). On the other hand, the punishment is not carried out in Sophocles. Agamemnon gets his way in the *Little Iliad*; against what opposition, we do not know. Hence

¹¹² For cremation as the regular means of disposing of a corpse in Homer see the list of passages in Holt (1992) 320.

post-mortem mistreatment of Ajax was within the parameters of the myth, and so Sophocles' audience could not have taken for granted the frustration of Agamemnon's ban. How Aeschylus treated the question is unknown.

The confrontation of warriors over Ajax's corpse found in two images of c. 600 and 580 anticipates the powerful visual tableau in Sophocles of Teucer and Menelaus/Agamemnon facing each other with Ajax lying between them.

(viii) If Aesch. fr. 84a, from his *Threissai*, comes from a description of Ajax, Aeschylus' protagonist seems to have had a hedonistic side absent from Sophocles' character. Sophocles' chorus, however, laments the absent joys of the symposium (1199–1205/6). Could Sophocles have transferred this motif from Ajax to the chorus in order to stress the austerity of the former in comparison with Aeschylus' protagonist?

(ix) Teucer's description of Ajax's defence of the ships involves the reworking of Iliadic material to Ajax's benefit (1272–9n.). A more daring adaptation of Homer occurs in the first episode, where the encounter between Tecmessa and Ajax is closely modelled on that between Andromache and Hector in *Iliad* 6 (485–524n., 545–82n.).¹¹³

(x) The conciliatory attitude taken by Odysseus in the final scene might look back to his sympathetic words in the *Odyssey*. The refusal of the epic Ajax to be reconciled with his enemy even in death is picked up and transformed by Sophocles, who has Teucer refuse Odysseus' offer of assistance at Ajax's funeral on the ground that it might anger the dead man (1393–5).¹¹⁴ The refusal is all the more striking in Sophocles, and Ajax's presumed anger all the greater, because his Odysseus, unlike Homer's, takes decisive and disinterested action on behalf of the dead Ajax.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ For Sophocles' use of Homer in this play more generally see Möllendorff (2001).

¹¹⁴ Cf. Knox (1961) 28 = (1979) 151–2.

¹¹⁵ See 1411–13n. for another possible use of the Homeric passage.

INTRODUCTION

5 HEROISM

(A) THE 'SOPHOCLEAN HERO'

An influential strand of criticism of *Ajax* celebrates the intransigence of its protagonist as something essentially admirable and heroic. This attitude, already found in early literary analysis of the play,¹¹⁶ achieves its canonical expression in Knox (1964). In the first two chapters of his book, Knox describes characteristics shared by six of Sophocles' protagonists (leaving *Trachiniae* out of consideration): firmness of will, refusal to listen to advice, isolation, preference for death over surrender, and so on. According to Knox, 'it is through this refusal to accept human limitations that humanity achieves its true greatness' (p. 27). The common characteristics of these protagonists make up the 'heroic temper' of the book's title, while Knox's collective term for the figures themselves is 'the Sophoclean hero': a 'strange and awesome character . . . an extraordinary figure' (p. 44), whose determination and single-mindedness command even divine approval (p. 27). The phrase 'Sophoclean hero' has since become a commonplace of Sophoclean criticism, and Knox's approach continues to attract followers. Two recent widely-cited works, March (1991–3) and Garvie's commentary, take a strongly favourable view of *Ajax* as a hero.¹¹⁷

But although Knox and his followers identify characteristics which these figures share to varying degrees, they do not

¹¹⁶ Cf. Perrotta (1935) 126: 'dopo aver espressa nel prologo la sua religiosità profonda, credè di poter abbandonarsi ad esaltare la grandezza del suo eroe'. In Reinhardt (1947) 38–9 ≈ (1979) 30 'the purpose of the finale is rather to contrast the genuine greatness of the tragic hero who was fated to die with the spuriousness and conceit of those who opposed him . . . – their ingratitude, pusillanimity, envy, meanness and arrogance', the phrase 'the tragic hero' is not in R.'s German.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Scullion (2001) 221: 'it is clearly so obvious to G[arvie] that the Sophoclean hero is a great and admirable figure beyond the mundane values and petty carping of lesser mortals that he feels no inclination to deprecate and little need to justify the hero's behavior either in general or in particular.'

demonstrate why such characteristics should command such awed approval. The problem is partly linguistic. ‘Hero’ denotes both the protagonist of a play and a person acclaimed for great and mighty deeds; the former is morally neutral, the latter implies moral approbation. The expression ‘the Sophoclean hero’ is obviously legitimate in the former sense: Sophocles wrote plays which contained protagonists. But if we are to use it with the latter meaning – that is, if we are to say that these protagonists excite admiration – we need to argue the case. Knox seems to rely instead on verbal slippage between the two senses of ‘hero’.¹¹⁸ March and Garvie do attempt to justify their position, but their arguments involve much misinterpretation; I discuss their case in individual notes in the Commentary.¹¹⁹ Scholars will always have legitimate disagreements over the overall level of approval which Ajax obtains from the audience, but it is hard to maintain that his actions incur no disapproval, or only trivial levels of it, during the course of the drama. The ‘Sophoclean hero’ model is also often associated with a downgrading of all other characters, who become foils to the protagonist instead of figures of interest in their own right; this too hardly seems to fit the play as we have it.¹²⁰

‘Hero’ and ‘Sophoclean hero’ have become question-begging words in scholarship. Used as default designators for Ajax, they implicitly evoke an unsupported set of assumptions. The audience may well admire Ajax at some points during the play, and their overall impression of him might in the end be positive; but it is foolish to use terms which imply that our investigation will

¹¹⁸ Existential philosophy may have anachronistically influenced his view. Cf. Bradshaw (1991) 121: ‘his final actions, terrible, irrevocable, make Ajax, from the modern perspective, an existential hero for his refusal to endure life on any terms other than those he himself finds acceptable. How a fifth-century audience in Athens would have responded to this resolute intransigence is less easily ascertained.’

¹¹⁹ Cf. 74n., 421–6n., 550–1n., 774–5n., [1028–39n.].

¹²⁰ Cf. Scullion (2001) 222 (‘the most baleful consequence of this approach is that G<arvie> comes close to turning the other characters into ciphers’), Kitto (1966) 176.

INTRODUCTION

inevitably conclude with such an outcome. Accordingly, I avoid them throughout the Commentary. Keeping clear of prejudicial terminology, I attempt to analyse to what extent Ajax excites the audience's sympathy, pity, criticism, and admiration at different times during the play.

(B) THE 'LAST OF THE HEROES'

The word 'hero' is prominent in a second trend in Sophoclean scholarship, this time peculiar to our play: the idea of Ajax as 'last of the heroes'. This phrase too is owed to Knox. According to him, '[Ajax's] death is the death of the old Homeric (and especially Achillean) individual ethos which had for centuries of aristocratic rule served as the dominant ideal of man's nobility and action, but which by the fifth century had been successfully challenged and largely superseded . . . by an outlook more suitable to the conditions of the polis, an outlook which reached its most developed form in democratic Athens. Ajax is presented to us throughout in terms of this heroic morality.' By contrast, Ajax's enemy Odysseus 'is by nature most adapted to the conditions of life in the polis, the ordered society', and is therefore able to bring resolution to the impasse brought about by Ajax's actions. But at the end of the play, 'a heroic age has passed away, to be succeeded by one in which action is replaced by argument, stubbornness by compromise, defiance by acceptance. The heroic self-assertion of an Achilles, an Ajax, will never be seen again.'¹²¹ In Burton's similar view, the play dramatises 'a conflict between two worlds, the world of the Homeric warrior and a more compassionate and humane world to which Odysseus belongs, and in which Ajax is an alien'.¹²² This conflict is usually framed in terms of values. Ajax represents the

¹²¹ Knox (1961) 20-1, 22, 2 = (1979) 144, 145, 126.

¹²² Burton (1980) 11; cf. Gardiner (1987) 50, referring to the view that 'his is the tragedy of the passing away of the old order, the heroic ideal that can no longer be applied in a nonheroic age'.

old, Homeric morality of competition and desire for honour; he must yield to a new, fifth-century ethic based on the good of the community.¹²³

I have the following reservations about this influential model.

(i) It overstates the distinction between the Homeric poems and the classical period; esteem for competitive and cooperative virtues is prominent in both.¹²⁴ (ii) It overstates the similarity between Sophocles' Ajax and the warriors of Homer.¹²⁵ Attempts to justify Ajax's extreme actions and utterances via Homeric parallels fall apart when those alleged parallels are sifted. The effect is one of contrast, not similarity, as Ajax fails to satisfy a range of obligations common to both periods, including the requirement to look after one's φίλοι, or to have regard for more than one's personal τιμή.¹²⁶ (iii) Odysseus' world-view contains nothing which Homer would have found unusual, and nothing peculiarly democratic.¹²⁷ Sophocles' play does indeed contain 'a recurrent contrast between individualistic

¹²³ So for Segal (1995) 17, the play portrays tensions 'between the old aristocratic individualism of the warrior ethos, exemplified in Homer, and the democracy's need for compromise, negotiation, and the harmonizing of class differences'; for Konstan (1998) 297, Ajax 'represents an archaic ideal of individual power and honour that is anomalous in the civic world represented by Odysseus, Agamemnon, and Menelaos'.

¹²⁴ See Finkelberg (1998) 19, Cairns (1993b) 162 with 166 n. 33 ≈ (2001) 216 with nn. 38–9, Lawrence (2005) 29, W. Allan (2006) 9.

¹²⁵ I eschew the term 'Homeric/epic hero'. Scholars could avoid much question-begging if they kept to, say, 'Homeric warriors' and 'Sophoclean protagonists'.

¹²⁶ See 36–50n., 421–6n., 774–5n. Cf. Goldhill (1986) 156, for whom Ajax 'does not simply reflect an Homeric model but offers a specific depiction, distorted in its extremism'; Minadeo (1987) 23 ('far from matching the moral standards set by an Achilles, Odysseus or Hector, he betrays the heroic code of conduct outright'); and Morwood (2008) 16, who rejects 'a common view of the play that sees the Sophoclean Ajax as an Homeric dinosaur compounded of heroic values and unable to cope in a newer (i.e. fifth-century) world'.

¹²⁷ Cf. Scodel (2003) 42: 'Odysseus uses arguments that could apply both within and across the borders of a single polis, in a democracy, oligarchy, or tyranny. The play thus subordinates its political themes to more general ethical concerns.'

INTRODUCTION

values . . . and values which, while still traditional, none the less emphasise more social, humane and other-regarding aspects of the complex of honour'; but 'Sophocles does not in any way have to innovate to create this effect; he simply sets the parts of the traditional complex in the context of the whole' (Cairns (1993a) 241).

(C) HERO CULT

The third use of the term 'hero' in connexion with Ajax is associated with hero cult. Here the word 'hero' is legitimate, since it corresponds to the classical Greek ἥρως; that is, a dead man in receipt of ritual offerings from worshippers who believed that he possessed power to help and harm from beyond the grave. Here too, however, we must guard against linguistic slippage from this Greek concept into modern nuances, since 'heroism' in the everyday positive sense is not a requirement for the honorand.¹²⁸ Our decision as to whether the play refers to such a cult of Ajax is independent of whether we believe that Ajax incurs approval or disapproval from the audience.¹²⁹

The Athenians probably adopted the cult of Ajax in the sixth century, after coming into conflict with the Megarians over Ajax's homeland of Salamis.¹³⁰ They located it in the Eurysakeion, a shrine to Eurysaces in the deme Melite, in the west of the city,¹³¹ perhaps simultaneously forging the association

¹²⁸ 'Heroic cult honours are not some kind of award for community service: even a community's enemy may achieve cult status in that community after death' (Cairns (2006) 99 with 121 n. 3).

¹²⁹ Cf. Schein (1997) 131 (who accepts the cult): 'it is not that Ajax and his actions seem any less raw and monstrous, only that the rawness and monstrosity are recognized as expressions of a more-than-ordinary power that can benefit those who will worship it.'

¹³⁰ This struggle was already under way in Solon's day (fr. 1, 2, 3 *IEG*); see further Kowalzig (2006) 86 n. 25.

¹³¹ Cf. L'Homme-Wéry (2000) 334 with nn. 10, 11.

of Ajax and Eurysaces, which was unknown to early epic.¹³² They altered the text of the *Iliad* to project Ajax's new Athenian connexions back into Homeric times.¹³³ At least one prominent Athenian family, that of Miltiades, claimed descent from Ajax via another invented son of his, Philaeus (Pher. Ath. fr. 2 *EGM*). In 508/7 Clisthenes chose Ajax as eponymous hero for one of his ten tribes, the only hero from outside Attica.¹³⁴ By 421, statues of these heroes stood in the Agora (cf. Ar. *Pax* 1179–84). Ajax had a cult on Salamis, now firmly under Athenian control; a festival named after him, the 'Aianteia', is first attested in the Hellenistic period, but may well date to after the Persian invasion in 480, when Ajax was summoned from Salamis to give assistance to the Greeks, and later received a trireme for his pains.¹³⁵

Welcker first asserts the importance of this cult for Sophocles' play.¹³⁶ His suggestion is taken up by Jebb,¹³⁷ for him, the very existence of the cult means that an Athenian audience would take an especially keen interest in its necessary precondition, Ajax's burial. More recently, the debate has usually centred on whether the play contains references which could prompt the audience to understand the play through the prism of the cult.¹³⁸

¹³² Cf. Kearns (1989) 82, L'Homme-Wéry (2000) 335–6.

¹³³ Hom. *Il.* 2.[558], where Ajax locates his Salaminian troops next to those of the Athenians, and 12.[372], where Ajax and Teucer acquire a companion homonymous with an early Athenian king. Cf. Visser (1997) 449–52, West (1999a) 187, Burkert (2007) 60–2.

¹³⁴ Hdt. 5.66.2; cf. Kron (1976) 171–6.

¹³⁵ Hdt. 8.121.1. Cf. R. Parker (1996) 154 n. 6, (2005) 456, Kowalzig (2006) 86 n. 28.

¹³⁶ Welcker (1829) 64–6 = (1845) 282–4.

¹³⁷ In his commentary, pp. xxx–xxxii.

¹³⁸ Supporters of hero cult include Burian (1972), Henrichs (1993), Cairns (2006) 111; further references in Barker (2004) 3 n. 10. Contrast Pearson (1922) 129 ('if it was Sophocles' intention to make the hero-cult the mainspring of the dramatic action, he has completely failed to give it the prominence which it deserved'), Perrotta (1935) 128, Taplin (1978) 189 n. 4, Golder (1992) 351, R. Parker (2005) 143 n. 31.

INTRODUCTION

The key passage is found after Tecmessa's return with Eurysaces from the hut to the grove. Teucer addresses the boy as follows (1171–5):

ὦ παῖ, πρόσσελθε δεῦρο, καὶ σταθεὶς πέλας
ἱκέτης ἔφαψαι πατρός, ὅς σ' ἐγείνατο.
θάκει δὲ προστρόπαιος ἐν χεροῖν ἔχων
κόμας ἐμὰς καὶ τῆσδε καὶ σαντοῦ τρίτου,
ἱκτήριον θησαυρόν.

Eurysaces makes an act of supplication by the side of his dead father (cf. ἱκέτης, προστρόπαιος, ἱκτήριον). Teucer implies that it would be wrong for anyone to remove him from the body while he holds on to it. A corpse is not a usual locus for supplication.¹³⁹ But the tomb of a hero is (1164–84n.). The audience may infer that Teucer implies that Ajax enjoys heroic status, and that in the absence of a burial-place, his unadorned corpse provides asylum for his son. At the very least, Teucer treats Ajax's body as 'a kind of sacred object' (Taplin (1978) 108). The tableau of Eurysaces and Tecmessa by the body remains in place almost to the end of the play, a constant reminder of Teucer's instructions. Yet Ajax's status remains implied, not stated. Teucer follows the words quoted above with a vigorous curse, reinforced by sympathetic magic, against anyone who drags Eurysaces away (1175–9), and concludes by urging the chorus to act as protectors in his absence (1182–4). Eurysaces' act of supplication is thus one of a series of defence mechanisms which Teucer puts in place as he departs.

The play contains no other possible references to Ajax's heroic status. Alleged references in the language of this section turn out to be illusory (1166–7n., 1180–1n.). Odysseus' description of Ajax as an ἄλκιμος νεκρός is a conciliatory compliment to his dead enemy which may rework an Homeric expression (1318–19n.), not an acknowledgement of heroic status. Teucer's later fear

¹³⁹ Indeed, touching one would normally result in pollution (cf. R. Parker (1983) 37 with n. 17, 39 with n. 27).

that Odysseus' involvement in the burial may prove *δυσχερές* to Ajax is explicable in terms of the shades of the dead retaining the passions, if not the power to act on them, which they possessed while alive (1393–5n.). Teucer avoids giving distress to Ajax because he does not want to distress his half-brother; there is no suggestion that the latter could retaliate in the manner of an angry hero. Similarly, the reference in the final lines to the 'black force' (*μέλαν μένος*) still issuing from Ajax's body is a physical counterpart to the mental *μένος* that Odysseus in the *Odyssey* criticises him for retaining in the Underworld (1411–13n.), not a hint of enduring power to harm.

Sophocles could have drawn attention to hero cult. An off-stage conversation with Calchas could have motivated Odysseus' entry at 1316. He might have faced down Agamemnon, and then delivered the spectacular news that Ajax was to enjoy hero cult. This would have been attractive in structural terms, too. Calchas had already shown himself favourable to Ajax's party, and a previous entrant from the Greek camp had communicated a message from him revealing divine information from the gods about Ajax's imminent doom. Odysseus' entry announcing Ajax's imminent heroisation would have nicely balanced and reversed this earlier scene. A specific reference to Athenian cult, if present, would have picked up the reference to Athens at the end of the previous choral ode (1221/2). Not only will the chorus see Athens again, they will see Ajax celebrated as a hero. Once again he will afford them protection (1211–1215/16).

Sophocles chose otherwise. Eurysaces' act of supplication hints at heroic status for Ajax, but after that, there is nothing. The dénouement, Agamemnon's decision to permit the burial, is the result of Odysseus' intervention, and has nothing to do with Ajax *qua* hero or any religious awe for his body.¹⁴⁰ This can hardly be because the cult was Athenian and thus so familiar to the audience that it needed no emphasis. Ajax's suicide, say, was also a familiar part of the Ajax myth, but that does not stop

¹⁴⁰ As Griffin (1999b) 87–8 n. 49 notes.

INTRODUCTION

Sophocles from giving it prominence. The playwright has artistic autonomy, within generic limits, to decide what is important, and the audience will respond to that.

If the supplication hints at heroic status, an explanation of this passage must account for (i) why such a hint is present and (ii) why it receives no subsequent attention, aside from the persistent tableau. In answer to (i), Ajax's earlier hope that Teucer would look after Eurysaces (560–4, 990–1) is now balanced by Teucer's use of Ajax's corpse for that same purpose. It confers dignity on Ajax: for the first time in the play he contributes to the well-being of his family. The scene balances Ajax's reception of Eurysaces into the *ekkyklema* in the first episode; both scenes involve physical contact between father and son. Earlier Ajax wanted to school his son in the ways of war so that he would punish his father's enemies, then abandoned him through his suicide; now, although dead, he helps to protect him as a father should. As for (ii), the establishment of a hero cult for Ajax, or the prophecy of one, would have jarred with the mood which Sophocles creates at the end of the play. Odysseus' pity and honour for Ajax lead him to ensure his burial. But he remains barred from the funeral which he himself has made possible. It will be limited to Ajax and his supporters; touching is permitted to Eurysaces (1172), but not Odysseus (1394). Meanwhile, Teucer's vulgar cursing suggests that he has learned little from Odysseus' magnanimity (1374–1401n.). The emphasis on the collective provided by hero cult would be at odds with the somewhat ungenerous spirit of this closing section.

By inserting a brief suggestion, potent but limited, of Ajax's heroic power, Sophocles achieves certain aims; by omitting to follow through and expand on this suggestions, he achieves others. This may involve a narrative feint. Members of the audience conscious of how tragedies sometimes end with the establishment of a cult may have wondered, during lines 1171–5, whether the Athenian cult of Ajax was going to feature at the conclusion of the play. Its surprising failure to appear may

have encouraged them to consider what Sophocles meant by its absence.

6 UNITY

Ajax's suicide at line 865 removes the central character with some 40 per cent of the play still to come. How does Sophocles maintain the interest of his audience after the loss of such a memorable figure?¹⁴¹ More generally, how does he ensure that the play makes sense as a whole, apart from through the obvious unity involved in a largely linear plot? In this section I focus briefly on three of the many possible answers to this question; I discuss them at greater length in Finglass (2011a).

(A) REHABILITATION

After the often ambivalent, even deprecatory, portrayal of Ajax in the earlier part of the play,¹⁴² the latter section serves to rehabilitate him, encouraging the audience to consider him from new perspectives even after his death. The inadequacy of his enemies, Menelaus and Agamemnon, helps to achieve this goal; so too his chief defender, Teucer, is a somewhat inferior champion.¹⁴³ The squabbling and point-scoring which take up so much of their exchanges present a contrast with Ajax which is much to his advantage. At least there was a certain grandeur and dignity about the monologues delivered by the fallen protagonist.

¹⁴¹ At least one ancient critic was scathing about the latter section. According to Σ 1123 (p. 227 Chr.), τὰ τοιαῦτα σοφίσματα οὐκ οἰκεῖα τραγωδίας. μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀναίρεσιν ἐπεκτείνειν τὸ δράμα θελήσας ἐψυχρεύσατο καὶ ἔλυσε τὸ τραγικὸν πάθος ('such quibbles are not appropriate to tragedy. Sophocles' desire to prolong the action after the suicide led to a frigid result, and the destruction of the tragic pathos'), while on 1127 (p. 228) we read τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον κωμωδίας μᾶλλον ἢ τραγωδίας ('this sort of thing belongs more to comedy than tragedy').

¹⁴² See §5(a) above and the notes in the commentary to which it refers.

¹⁴³ See 1052–90n., 1093–1117n., 1120–41n., 1223–1373n., 1374–1401n.

INTRODUCTION

Sophocles employs other techniques to this end. The moving laments of Tecmessa and the chorus, followed by Teucer's distraught speech over Ajax's body, emphasise the grief and loss which his death has caused to his immediate family.¹⁴⁴ The tableau of Eurysaces holding on to his father's corpse in the posture of a suppliant, as arranged by Teucer, suggests that there is something numinous about his body.¹⁴⁵ The chorus describe how their long sufferings at Troy have been accentuated through the loss of their only defender.¹⁴⁶ Teucer's speech in his debate with Agamemnon, before he is side-tracked into defending his lineage and attacking Agamemnon's, powerfully vindicates Ajax's massive contribution to the Greek war effort (1266–89). Even Odysseus, Ajax's great enemy and the recipient of the Arms of Achilles, intervenes on his behalf and acknowledges that Ajax's good qualities should take precedence over their enmity.¹⁴⁷

The final moments of the play bring other sides of Ajax's character to the fore. Teucer is unable to accept Odysseus' offer of help for the funeral, in case that assistance is 'unwelcome' (*δυσχερές*) to the dead man (1393–5n.). Even after death, and even after Odysseus' decisive intervention to secure his burial, Teucer suspects that Ajax will not relent from his anger against his old foe. Then as Teucer prepares to lift the corpse, he remarks at how its arteries are still pumping the 'dark force' (*μέλαν μένος*) of his blood. *μένος* can denote the battle rage of the hero, and so suggests the persistence of violent emotion even as the body is laid to rest (1411–13n.). This circumscribes and qualifies Ajax's rehabilitation, ensuring that the largely positive presentation of Ajax in the final scenes does not negate the earlier parts of the play. Sophocles brings his audience to a complex view of his protagonist, which ignores neither his virtues nor his vices. He achieves this to a degree by the diptych structure, in which the first part emphasises the darker side of Ajax's character, and the

¹⁴⁴ 937–73, 992–1027. ¹⁴⁵ See §5(c) above.

¹⁴⁶ 1185–1222, especially 1211–15. ¹⁴⁷ 1332–45, 1355, 1357.

latter its more positive aspects, although even this is by no means a clear-cut divide.

(B) STRUCTURE

Ajax's suicide is followed by the reappearance of the chorus; both incidents mark a new beginning. But there are at least three other clear divisions in the play: 814 (the change of scene), 973 (where Tecmessa speaks her last line, and is supplanted by Teucer as Ajax's chief defender), and 1040 (where Menelaus' approach leads to a focus on Ajax's burial). The presence of alternative divisions prevents the most important dividing point, 865, from assuming an unchallenged prominence in terms of its structural function, and thus from effecting too definitive a breach between different parts of the play.

The alternation between song, speech, and recitative, which is fundamental to all tragedy, is also used to good structural effect. For example, the speculation concerning Ajax's recent expedition in which Tecmessa and the chorus engage from 134 to 330 is conveyed in a mixture of song, speech, and recitative, which prevents monotony and explores different levels and types of emotion. Sophocles' placing of individual scenes shows similar variety. Two substantial *rheseis* which each take up an entire scene (646–92, 815–65) are separated by an episode full of bustle, with several exits and entrances and various types of utterance, including two different types of stichomythia.¹⁴⁸ We can observe a similar effect between the two lengthy speeches at 815–65 and 992–1027, where again a scene of activity and interaction contrasts with the static *rheseis* which surround it. Units such as Ajax's suicide speech are not mere set-pieces, but integrated parts of a work carefully planned.

The delay, and consequent anticipation, of a crucial element of the plot can also help to unify the structure: for example, the

¹⁴⁸ Thus Goward (1999) 89: 'the two *rhēseis*, uttered in actual or virtual solitude, contrast violently with the "busy" group activities that come between them, characterised by misunderstanding, urgency, futility, even muddle'.

INTRODUCTION

part played by the gods in Ajax's demise. His enemy Athena appears in the prologue, and reveals how she prevented Ajax's attack on the army; the other characters later speculate about her role in the action, and that of the gods more generally.¹⁴⁹ But not until over half way through the play does the audience learn the underlying cause of Athena's anger: Ajax's arrogance, as directed against his father, Telamon, and the goddess herself (748–83n.). By holding back this vital detail Sophocles ensures the partial and gradual revelation of a major aspect of his plot. Ajax's current peril is the consequence not just of his reaction to the Judgment of the Arms, but of arrogant behaviour towards others which long predates his arrival at Troy (612/13–616/17n.). As the play moves forward, the audience receives additional information regarding the remoter past, which enables them to make progressively more informed judgments regarding the characters and their actions.

(C) THEMES

Themes too help to unify the play; the repetition of an idea or image encourages the audience to appreciate connexions between different parts of the drama. From the many possibilities I mention three, as follows.

(i) *Hunting and searching*. In the prologue (1–133n.) Athena remarks that Odysseus is on the hunt (θηρώμενον, 2) and compares him to a keen-scented Laconian dog (7–8). His quarry is no animal, however, but Ajax, himself a would-be hunter, who attempted to bring back his enemies as 'spoil' (ἄγρᾱ, 64, 93) to his hut to torture. Athena frustrates this hunt by sending him into the 'nets of disaster' (ἐρקה κακᾶ, 60). Odysseus' mission, also sped by Athena (36–7), thus turns the (failed) hunter Ajax into the object of a new, successful hunt, marking the reversal in his situation that has taken place even before the play begins.

¹⁴⁹ 172–82, 401a–402, 450–3, 952–3, 1057–60.

The chorus reprise this theme when they reappear in the epiparodos (866–78n.). They, like Odysseus, have been searching for Ajax; but whereas he was responding to an act of violence inflicted by Ajax on third parties, they are attempting to prevent him inflicting a similarly bloody act on himself. Both are brought to their goal by a female: Athena in Odysseus' case, Tecmessa in the chorus's. The chorus do not employ hunting imagery, any more than Tecmessa had when she despatched them (803–11), probably because that would dehumanise Ajax somewhat; he remains their lord, after all. But the similarity of situation allows the audience to draw a thematic connexion between the two passages, which are thus linked even as the latter marks a new beginning.

(ii) *Friends and enemies*. Helping friends and harming enemies is a fundamental aspect of Greek morality,¹⁵⁰ and Athena opens the play by noting how Odysseus is 'always on the hunt to seize some opportunity against his enemies' (1–2). The ἐχθρός in question is Ajax, Odysseus' comrade; yet Odysseus refuses Athena's invitation to indulge in mockery at his foe's discomfort (121–6n.).

When he next appears, Ajax begins by addressing his φίλοι; but his song quickly becomes a virtual monologue (348–429n.), a mode which recurs in the following speech (430–80), in which he declares himself the ἐχθρός of gods, Trojans, and Greeks (457–9). His decision to kill himself means that he rejects the bonds of φιλία which tie him to Tecmessa and Eurysaces. When he later appears to change his mind, he invokes a different maxim about friendship, one which emphasises its mutability (678–82n.). Ajax is lying: the army and his leaders remain his ἐχθροί. But he remains apparently unconcerned that his death will expose his φίλοι to mortal peril, and that he has thereby effectively turned from their φίλος into their ἐχθρός. Further back, his assault on the army also involved a move from φίλος to ἐχθρός, as Menelaus points out (1052–4). Though he may in

¹⁵⁰ See e.g. Blundell (1989) 26–31.

INTRODUCTION

part defy the maxim which he cites to deceive Tecmessa and the chorus, in other ways it provides an all too accurate description of his relationships.

The mutability of friendship is most apparent when Odysseus secures Ajax's burial. Acknowledging the enmity that existed between them, Odysseus argues that his valour and nobility nevertheless demand respect and honour.¹⁵¹ Agamemnon is amazed that Odysseus is supporting an enemy; for him, Ajax remains a foe.¹⁵² Odysseus achieves his breakthrough partly by stressing that Agamemnon would be doing a favour to him as a φίλος if he acted on his advice.¹⁵³ Ironically, φιλία between Ajax's two chief enemies turns out to be decisive in effecting his burial.

Yet while Odysseus can turn from enemy into friend, Ajax is unwilling to reciprocate; at least, that is the view of Teucer, who asks Odysseus not to participate in his burial (1393–5). Although Ajax previously described how friends can become enemies, and enemies friends, even after death he apparently resists the latter, more optimistic side of the maxim, preferring to dwell on the cynical former part. Throughout the play, the differing attitudes which he and other characters have towards friendship and enmity are of central importance in determining the audience's reactions to them.¹⁵⁴

(iii) *Fathers and sons*. Part of Ajax's grief at failing to be awarded the Arms of Achilles lies in his failure to emulate his father, Telamon, who sacked Troy alongside Heracles (434–40n.). Tecmessa encourages him to consider a wider range of relationships and responsibilities – among them his duty towards his son, Eurysaces (485–524n.). Ajax in his reply shows little understanding of the danger that his son will soon face (545–82n.); his prayer that Eurysaces will be 'more fortunate than [his] father, but in all other respects the same' (550–1n.) implies that Ajax's own

¹⁵¹ 1336–41, 1344–6, 1359. ¹⁵² 1356, 1372–3. ¹⁵³ 1353, 1370–1.

¹⁵⁴ 'In time, friends turn into enemies and enemies into friends. The *Ajax* itself is a bewildering panorama of such changed and changing relationships' (Knox (1961) 10 = (1979) 133; see also Goldhill (1986) 85–8).

failure to match his father's attainments is the result of chance, and nothing to do with his own character, attitudes, and actions. Nor does he wish to be surpassed by his son, as he is surpassed by his father. Later on, the Messenger's speech reveals that Telamon is not just an unbeatable standard of valour which Ajax has failed to match, but also a wise counsellor whom Ajax has failed to heed (762–70n.). If Ajax, who expects obedience from his son, had listened to his own father's words, he might have emulated him instead of being crushed by disgrace.

Teucer's thoughts, too, naturally turn to Telamon as he delivers his lament over the body. He imagines his reaction not to news of his son's death, but to his other son's return, describing at length the insults which he, Teucer, will receive as a result of his 'betrayal' of his brother (1008–21). Now it is Teucer, not Ajax, who has failed his father and must anticipate his scorn. Later, faced with Agamemnon's contempt for his allegedly barbarian origin (1259–63), Teucer retorts by boasting of his parentage: Telamon's great deeds at Troy become at last a subject of pride rather than apprehension (1299–1303). Agamemnon's father, by contrast, is associated with the unspeakable crime of the Thyestean banquet (1293–4n.). The relationship between fathers and sons now at last turns in favour of Ajax's house. During this exchange, and indeed for the last 250 lines of the play, Eurysaces is clasping his father's body, where Teucer has directed him to remain as a suppliant (1171–81). Having abandoned his son in life, Ajax at least protects him in death. The reversal of this thematic idea contributes to the rehabilitation of Ajax which the audience witness in the closing scenes.

7 POLITICS¹⁵⁵

Ajax mentions the πόλις twice. Ajax imagines the lamentation which his mother will stir up 'in the entire city' on hearing

¹⁵⁵ For allegorical interpretations of *Ajax* in political terms see n. 30 above.

INTRODUCTION

of his death (850–1); Menelaus declares that an army and a city both require strict discipline in order to prosper (1073–83). Individual *poleis* receive a mention, too (Athens, Troy, Sparta). These disparate references do not constitute a theme.¹⁵⁶ The general lack of interest in politics is apparent in the final stasimon. This ends by evoking a journey back to Athens (1217/18–1221/2), but the emphasis is on place, not political institutions or public buildings. With the chorus's list of the absent delights of the symposium (1199–1205/6), we may contrast the exiled Alcaeus' anguish at being deprived of the ἀγορά and βουλή of Mytilene.¹⁵⁷

Some scholars see a general connexion between tragedy and democratic politics. Goldhill (2009) 48 argues that 'the most profound questioning of democracy . . . is not to be found by searching through the tragic texts for any direct engagement with specific political policies or concrete issues of foreign or domestic strategy. Tragedy's politics is to be found rather in the searing exploration of the basic elements of democratic principle: responsibility, duty, masculinity, decision-making, self-control, and so on.' I agree that tragedy dramatises issues of responsibility and so forth. But this dramatisation is not always political,¹⁵⁸ and when it is, those politics are not always democratic.¹⁵⁹ What Goldhill calls 'the basic elements of democratic principle' are common to any society. Citizens and non-citizens in democracies, oligarchies, and tyrannies had, for example, to make decisions and exercise self-control. The playwright is free to evoke specifically democratic ideas and

¹⁵⁶ Contrast *Electra*, where the πόλις plays a somewhat more important function; see Finglass (2005c).

¹⁵⁷ Fr. 130b.1–5 Voigt δ πάλαις ἔγω | ζῶω μοῖραν ἔχων ἀγροῖω τίκαν | ἡμέρων ἀγόρας ἄκουσαι | καρὺ [ζο]μένης ὤγεσι λᾶϊδα | καὶ β[ε]λλας.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Easterling (1997b) 52 on how the myths of tragedy furnish 'subjects which were multivalent enough to be used for the dramatisation of a *range of possible issues, political, social, moral or existential*, without imposing a narrowly limiting interpretation on any of them' (my italics).

¹⁵⁹ See Rhodes (2003) on how aspects of tragedy which may be 'political' are not necessarily 'democratic'.

8 TEXT

practices in his portrayal; equally, he is free to direct his audience's attention elsewhere.

8 TEXT

(A) SOURCES

(i) *Ancient manuscripts*

Four fragments of ancient manuscripts of *Ajax* survive, all written on papyrus.¹⁶⁰

Π¹ dates to the second century and contains parts of 1–11. Gronewald (1987) first published the papyrus, and I have consulted it online. It contains no significant readings; this is as expected, since there do not appear to be textual problems in the mediaeval tradition of these lines.

Π² dates to the late second or early third century and contains parts of 51–67, 266–76, and 291–307. Hunt (1927a) first published the papyrus, and I have consulted it online. It contains four unique readings, all errors (57, 63–5, 294 (ε wrongly written for α, which is added above the line), 305). It shares errors at 293 with Aristotle (the correct reading added above the line), at 297 with all mediaeval manuscripts, and at 299 with some mediaeval manuscripts (orthographical). This is not a reliable source.

Π³ dates to the fourth century and contains parts of 694–705 and 753–64. Grenfell and Hunt (1919) first published the papyrus, including a plate of the first part; I take my readings from them. It contains one, perhaps two, unique readings: at 756 (probably right) and, possibly, 759 (if so, it is wrong). At 699 it contains a true reading not found elsewhere, but which must have been the original reading of the *Suda*. It always contains the correct reading when the mediaeval manuscripts are divided (694, 695, 698, 755, 761; only LKP match its accuracy

¹⁶⁰ In each case the date of the manuscript is that given by its first editor. For the identity and current locations of the manuscripts mentioned in this section see the Index Siglorum.

INTRODUCTION

in all five places), and it is right with the mediaeval manuscripts against the secondary tradition at 760. Such a success rate over a small quantity of preserved text suggests a valuable manuscript, despite its relatively late date. One wonders how many other correct readings it contained which today are lost.

Π⁴ dates to the fifth or sixth century and contains parts of 921–926/7 and 950–7. Maehler (1984) 5–6 first published the papyrus; I take my readings from him. It is right with most mediaeval manuscripts at 951 and 954/5, wrong with all mediaeval manuscripts at 921 and 957, and probably wrong with most mediaeval manuscripts at 926/7 and 956 (the reading is uncertain in each case).

(ii) *Mediaeval manuscripts*

Ajax is found in over 150 mediaeval manuscripts.¹⁶¹ The oldest are L, Λ, and K: L is dated to perhaps the mid-tenth century, Λ to about the same period, and K to the second half of the twelfth century.¹⁶² Even K, the latest of the three, is about a century older than our next oldest sources.¹⁶³

L provides our earliest evidence for dozens of correct readings, and our sole evidence for four.¹⁶⁴ Λ, by contrast, is not especially valuable, partly because it seems to offer a text very close to L's, partly because it has fewer readings to offer as a result of its mutilated state. It preserves perhaps one unique correct reading,

¹⁶¹ In what follows, when I date a manuscript without giving a reference, the date is taken from Turyn (1944) and (1952), altered in the light of N. Wilson (1976) 172, (1977) 169, (1980) 219, (1983b) 167–8, and Ll-J/W, OCT (pp. vii–xii).

¹⁶² See respectively Finglass (2008) 441–2 n. 5, Hecquet-Devienne (1994) 16–17, Finglass (2008) 441 n. 4. According to Ll-J/W, OCT p. vii, L and Λ were written by the same scribe.

¹⁶³ My readings of L are taken from Thompson and Jebb (1885), of Λ from Scheltema (1948) and (1949), and of K from a microfilm lent by Nigel Wilson.

¹⁶⁴ Lines 232 (probably), 1098, 1120, 1137. This excludes places such as 101, 961, and 980, where L uniquely provides correct orthography or accentuation.

and contains the earliest attestation of two more.¹⁶⁵ K provides a single unique correct reading, one unique correct speaker attribution, and one correct reading attested elsewhere only in the secondary tradition; twice it joins with L in attesting the truth against all other manuscripts.¹⁶⁶ While showing a strong affinity to L, it nevertheless is often correct when L is wrong; in such cases, it provides our earliest evidence for the reading in question.¹⁶⁷ When all three manuscripts have the same reading, I represent them by the letter **L**.¹⁶⁸

The ancient manuscripts, and the three oldest mediaeval manuscripts, constitute an obvious foundation for the apparatus criticus. But if we relied on them alone, how much would we miss? I count eighty-five places where I print a reading found in at least one manuscript, but not in the papyri or LAK. Of these, forty-two are concerned with orthography, accents, word-division, final nu, and the like; let us leave them out of consideration. That still leaves forty-three places where a more substantive point is at issue.

Of the manuscripts for which collations are available, five stand out: A, D, Xr, Xs, and Zr.¹⁶⁹ Dawe first noticed that they make up a group, to which Ll-J/W assign the siglum **a**. They range from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries: A dates from 1270 to 1300, according to the most recent account,¹⁷⁰ and Zr from about 1325,¹⁷¹ while D is from the first half of

¹⁶⁵ Lines 450; 451, 469. ¹⁶⁶ Lines 1000, 371, 679; 706, 1187/8.

¹⁶⁷ See Finglass (2008) 445–8.

¹⁶⁸ This should not be confused with **L** in Ll-J/W's OCT, which stands for only L and Λ.

¹⁶⁹ My readings of A are taken from Bodley MS Film 1866, of the others from Dawe, *STS* II.

¹⁷⁰ Thus Hecquet-Devienne (1994) 27–31. Turyn (1944) 29 puts it in the 13th century, while according to O. Smith (1975) 92–3 n. 70, it was written in the very early 14th century. Other scholars prefer a simple 14th century date (thus K. B. Hase and Gaisford, *teste* Dobree *ap.* Porson (pre-1808c) vii, Koster (1959), Turyn (1949) 141).

¹⁷¹ Thus Turyn (1960) 1013 n. 1; cf. Mioni (1982) 211 (not later than 1325), West (1990) 347 (1320–5). Turyn (1964) 126 justifies the date as follows: Zr shows

INTRODUCTION

the fourteenth century, Xs from the second half, and Xr from 1412. In twenty-three of the forty-three places, A gives the right reading; the figures for the other manuscripts are 23 D, 26 Xr, 25 Xs, and 24 Zr. Fully nineteen places show the whole **a** group united in the truth against L(Λ)K. Figures for other manuscripts are substantially lower. Moreover, of the forty-three cases, only eleven are not represented by at least one manuscript in the **a** group. In other words, in the whole play there are only eleven places where I print a substantive manuscript reading (that is, excluding matters of orthography and so forth) which is not in either a papyrus, L(Λ)K, or **a**. Even among the forty-two cases concerning orthographical matters and the like, where the chance of hitting on the true reading by a lucky fluke is much greater, at least one manuscript from the **a** group contains the truth in twenty-one instances.¹⁷²

It seems best to include all five of these manuscripts in the apparatus, since none is obviously superior, and they often disagree. When they are unified they can be abbreviated as **a** to save space; when divided, it is helpful to know that they attest more than one reading. So we now rely on Π¹Π²Π³Π⁴LAKADXrXsZr. Since some of these witnesses are only available in part, this leaves LKADXrXsZr, which I abbreviate as ω, as the regular basis for the apparatus.

At this point we should consider a further manuscript group, one consistently cited in the apparatus of recent critical editions: the so-called Roman family, consisting of G, R, and Q, to which

work by two scribes, who also collaborated on Vat. gr. 175, a manuscript securely dated (by subscription) to 1321/2; it also contains Triclinian scholia in the hand of one of these scribes, and so cannot be earlier than Triclinius' maturity. This manuscript used to be dated to the fifteenth century, a date still found in the editions by Dawe and Ll-J/W and in my *Electra*. According to Turyn (1952) 67 (*prob.* Mioni (1982)), Zr is 'most probably an apograph of Venice 617 (Zp)'.

¹⁷² Cf. West (1978b) 238: 'when L is corrupt, it is more often in [**a**] than anywhere else that the true reading is preserved, even after making all due allowance for scribal emendation'.

Ll-J/W give the siglum **r**.¹⁷³ G is dated to 1282,¹⁷⁴ R to the fifteenth century, and Q to the sixteenth. Turyn (1952) advocates a place in the apparatus for this group in the course of his argument that good readings in A and related manuscripts were the results of Byzantine conjecture without authority. Although Dawe explodes Turyn's argument against A and its fellows (*STS* 1 35–60), and has harsh words for the reliability of the **r** group (*ibid.* 94–6), he nevertheless regularly cites the latter in the apparatus of his editions. He is followed by Ll-J/W and by me in my *Electra*. Yet no one has asked whether we need **r** now that **a** is anchored in the apparatus. The question is even more pressing now that K has been redated; readings for which G was previously the oldest source now antedate that manuscript by a century or more. Indeed, several manuscripts are now dated to the end of the thirteenth century¹⁷⁵ or the beginning of the fourteenth,¹⁷⁶ which dulls the attractiveness of G's early date.

It turns out that the readings offered by **r** are disappointing. In the ten places where I print a manuscript reading not found in LAKADXrXsZr, that reading is only twice found in G, R, or Q.¹⁷⁷ Even among the twenty-one cases involving orthography and so forth, **r** contains the correct form in only six. There are three other occasions where Q, while wrong, nevertheless gets closer to the truth than most other manuscripts (297, 863, 884); but of these only the last is likely to be anything more than a slip, and there three other manuscripts record the correct reading. Such is the meagre contribution of **r** to our knowledge of the text of *Ajax*. The group also contains a large number of unique

¹⁷³ My readings of R are taken from Bodley MS Film 1873, and of G and Q from Dawe, *STS* II.

¹⁷⁴ For this manuscript see further Arnesano (1999).

¹⁷⁵ A, C, H, N, O, Wa (the last c. 1275, according to N. Wilson (1977) 169), Wb. V should probably be included in this list or the following one; Bevilacqua (1973) 72 dates it to the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century.

¹⁷⁶ Zr, F, Zc (c. 1310–20, according to O. Smith (1971–80) 39), Ambrosianus L 39 sup.

¹⁷⁷ At 456, where Q shares the truth with four other (earlier) manuscripts, and 1205/6, where **r** correctly place a δ.

INTRODUCTION

erroneous readings¹⁷⁸ which cannot all be put down to mistakes of copying. Several are likely to be deliberate emendations.¹⁷⁹ I discuss them in the commentary, and give my reasons for rejecting them all, with the exception of 1205/6. But since these manuscripts tell us almost nothing that could go back to Sophocles which we do not already know, I cite them only rarely in my apparatus.¹⁸⁰

We must now turn to the other manuscripts for which collations are available.¹⁸¹ The ten places mentioned above, where I print a manuscript reading not found in **la**, do not help to distinguish between them: only three manuscripts (apart from Q, discussed in the previous paragraph) contain more than one of the ten correct readings (Jb, Mosq. gr. 504, O). As with the **r** group, only under exceptional circumstances does any of these manuscripts reveal anything important which is not found in the papyri and **la**. As a result, I do not cite them except under

¹⁷⁸ Lines 40, 88, 235, 297, 351/2, 467, 773, [842], 864, 923-4, 951, [1039], 1113, 1116, 1127, 1253, 1330, [1417].

¹⁷⁹ Maas (1953) 441 argues that we cannot be sure that some of **r**'s readings are not the result of conjecture (he cites *OC* 278, but we now know that R's reading there is also found in K, and *Tr* 7, where see Davies); cf. Easterling (1967) 58-9, Dawe, *STS* 1 95-6. Van der Valk (1956) 449 disagrees.

¹⁸⁰ The same applies to GR in *Electra* (where Q is not extant); I regret not having attempted to remove any manuscripts from regular citation in the apparatus to my edition. There are only three places (excluding cases of accentuation at 491 and 863) where G, R, or both preserve truth not found in LAKADXRXSZr: at 57 (φέρωμεν G: -οιμεν cett.), 513 (τί R: τις cett.), and 1150 (θανόντα GR and a few other manuscripts: -τι codd. pler.). We might also include 857, where GR are joined by Wa^s and the scholia to L in offering ἔρωγαί where other manuscripts have -οί. Alongside these we must set a significant number of readings unique to GR which seem like bad conjectures or careless errors: 421, 463, 472, 536, 685, 824, 830, 1169, 1205, 1288, 1328, 1460, 1473, 1506.

¹⁸¹ Sources for these manuscripts are as follows. O, Laudianus gr. 54: autopsy. H, N, V: Dawe, *STS* II. C, F, P: Bodley MSS Film 1867, 1858, 1862. Δ: Dindorf (1825 ed.). J: Petrucione (1983). Ja: Turyn (1952) 89-90. S: Turyn (1952) 169 and Kopff (1993) 156-7. Wa: N. Wilson (1977) 169 and Ll-J/W, OCT. Wb: Peppink (1934) 157-8 = (1938) 61. Zb, Dresdensis Da. 22, Monacensis gr. 507: Erfurdt. Zu: Stefec (2009). Ambrosianus L 39 sup.: Pearson. Parisinus gr. 2820: Brunk.

those exceptional circumstances. I do rate these manuscripts somewhat higher than GRQ, however, because they do not exhibit the systematic introduction of conjectures.

The result is an apparatus much sparer than has become usual for a play of the Sophoclean triad (i.e. *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Oedipus Rex*, for which we have the most manuscripts). Since Dawe published collations of LADXrXsZrGRQCFHNOPPaV in 1975 (*STS* II), critical editions (by Dawe himself, by Ll-J/W, and by me for *Electra*) have regularly cited all these manuscripts. Yet with the exception of West (1978a) 106–8, no one has asked whether this is helpful. The mass of data which such a course presents is of little use in determining which readings are correct. Almost all the true readings offered by at least one manuscript are present in a selection of only seven. These also (together with the secondary tradition, discussed below) contain the great majority of the incorrect readings worth citing in the apparatus.

(iii) *The secondary tradition*

The richness of the manuscript evidence means that the secondary tradition has only a small part to play in the establishment of the text.¹⁸² Stobaeus preserves a unique true reading at 714.¹⁸³ In nine other places a secondary witness joins with a small number of Sophoclean manuscripts in the correct reading (six for the *Suda*, one shared with Favorinus; one each for Hesychius, Stobaeus, and Eustathius).¹⁸⁴ The

¹⁸² For Hesychius, Stobaeus, the *Suda*, and Eustathius I have chiefly relied on the editions of Latte/Hansen/Cunningham, W–H, Adler, Van der Valk, and Stallbaum, but have sometimes checked earlier editions too, as indicated in the commentary.

¹⁸³ For unique preservations in Stobaeus cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 443, Handley on Men. *Dysc.* 797–812, Görler (1963) 106–7.

¹⁸⁴ *Suda*: 33, 614/16, 624/5, 672 (with Favorinus: accentuation), 679, 699. Hesychius: 75. Stobaeus: 330. Eustathius: 579. Note also 656, where Hesychius' reading is an only slightly corrupt version of the text which I print; and [966], where some scholars adopt a reading originally found in the *Suda* and Eustathius.

INTRODUCTION

age of these sources leads me to cite them regularly in the apparatus.¹⁸⁵

(iv) *Triclinius*

Recent editions of Sophocles have been too deferential to the Byzantine scholar Triclinius. Dawe regularly cites the manuscript T (Parisinus gr. 2711, 14th c.), which is known to reflect his editorial activity; Ll-J/W augment this by citing Ta (Marcianus gr. 470, 15th c.) too, giving TTa the siglum **t**. In my *Electra* I continued the practice of Ll-J/W, except that (taking a hint from Kopff (1993) 158) I wrote not '**t**' but 'Triclinius' when the scholar identifies (via his scholia) a reading as his own conjecture. But as Sommerstein (2008) 287 points out (for Aristophanes), this is unhelpful. Our default position should be that Triclinius's unique readings are his own emendations, whether or not he claims them as such.¹⁸⁶ Yet when we write '**t**' unless Triclinius explicitly claims a reading for his own, we imply the opposite, and so give a specious veneer of manuscript authority to readings which should be treated as conjectures unless there is strong reason to do otherwise. Twice Triclinius claims to have found a reading in another manuscript now lost.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁵ As West (1977) 265 n. 3 points out, 'for Sophocles, as for Aristophanes, the *Suda* has the status of a fragmentary tenth-century manuscript' (cf. (1978b) 237). I do not cite the *Gnomologium Vatopedianum* (Athous Μονῆ Βατοπεδίου 36, 12th c.), since according to the collation of Christodoulou (1986) 23–5 it contains no readings of interest.

¹⁸⁶ Thus N. Wilson (1983a) 254: 'it is an excess of enthusiasm to maintain that this pioneer's readings deserve to be systematically recorded in the apparatus criticus of a modern edition'. *Contra* Dawe, *STS* 180: 'in view of Triclinius' access to ancient sources, and his critical ability which would have enabled him to distinguish between good sources and bad, it seems reasonable that the readings of T should be systematically reported in any apparatus.'

¹⁸⁷ 387 πάτερ (ὡς καὶ ἐν τινι τῶν βιβλίων ἠϋρηται) and 636/7 ἄριστος (οὕτω γὰρ εὗρέθη καὶ ἐν τινι τῶν παλαιῶν πάνυ); the latter reading is attested in other manuscripts as a gloss. I print ἄριστος but not πάτερ; the latter does have supporters, however.

While it is just possible that a unique reading of his, unaccompanied by such a scholium, could have been taken from another manuscript,¹⁸⁸ that is likely to be the exception rather than the rule.

I may add here (though it is not relevant to the issue of manuscript authority) that Triclinius makes a great contribution to the purification of Sophocles' text.¹⁸⁹ In thirteen places in lyrics and recitative he makes emendations which I accept, and which have not been found in manuscripts outside the Triclinian recension.¹⁹⁰ On four further occasions Triclinius's emendation, while not exactly what I print, nevertheless constitutes the key change to a corrupt passage.¹⁹¹ There are also eight places where Triclinius's reading looks like an emendation by him, although it is found in a small number of other, apparently non-Triclinian manuscripts as well.¹⁹²

(B) PRESENTATION

I attempt to attribute conjectures to the first scholar to propose them, and to give their place of publication, or, when they were not published, a reference to the source where they can be found. In the apparatus I do not distinguish between

¹⁸⁸ Cf. W. Barrett (2007) 430 n. 21: 'I would not exclude the possibility that even in Triclinios there may be an occasional vestige of otherwise unattested truth.'

¹⁸⁹ For the date of Triclinius's work on Sophocles see Janz (2005) 77 n. 4: 'All of Triclinius' work on tragedy (and indeed on classical poetry) seems to belong to the period after 1308, at which date he was still referring to himself as Τρικλίνης (in his subscription in the manuscript Oxford, New College 258)' (citing Turyn (1943) 103–7; cf. Stinton (1967) 537 = (1990) 79). Janz also notes (p. 76 n. 3) that Triclinius is still working on tragedy in about 1330, when he writes Naples II F 31, his autograph of Aeschylus, which is dated by watermarks (cf. West (1990) 351).

¹⁹⁰ Lines 198, *235, 235, *245/6, 372, 384, 390, 396, 419a, 598, 618, *619, 698. (In this and the following two footnotes I have asterisked places where Triclinius claims a reading as his own conjecture in his scholia.)

¹⁹¹ Lines *609/10, 903, 908/9, 1197.

¹⁹² Lines 185, *236, 380, 632, 737, 836, *1192, 1195/6.

INTRODUCTION

conjectures printed in a text, those suggested by their proposers as possibilities, and those later rejected by their proposers.¹⁹³ Similarly, I use simply ‘del.’ throughout to signal a proposed deletion, however much or little confidence the relevant scholar expressed in his proposal, rather than attempting to convey the nuances of the scholar’s attitude by using a variety of terms (‘secl.’, ‘susp.’, etc.). But I do specify when the first scholar to make a conjecture simultaneously rejects it; in that case both he and the first scholar to propose it positively are given credit (903, 1120).

Finglass (2009g) discusses orthographical questions pertaining to Sophocles, as well as the manner in which an editor should approach the presentation of orthographical data.

The line numeration is Brunck’s, as per modern convention. I employ the following practice in lyrics, since Brunck’s colometry is different from mine: my line 397/8 contains some of the text included in lines 397 and 398 of Brunck’s edition, and my lines 401a and 401b both contain only text found in Brunck’s line 401.

Ajax is quoted more than any other Sophoclean play, yet as explained above, unique readings in the secondary tradition are very rare. Even citing all the quotations from a limited range of sources (e.g. Stobaeus, the *Suda*, and Eustathius) would add considerable bulk to the apparatus to little purpose. So instead of giving precise references (which can easily be found in the indexes of the current editions of these works) I simply write *St*, *Su*, *Eu* etc. to indicate that one of these sources contains a reading.

I do not usually record the following: presence or absence of iota subscript, nu ephelkystikon (Dawe, *STS* 1 144 on 558, 591, 1380), breathing, errors involving Doric alpha, ξύν / σύν,

¹⁹³ Ll-J/W attempt to draw this distinction: for example, at 585 they write “‘fort. φράσον” Nauck’ rather than just ‘φράσον Nauck’. But many other conjectures which they mention without such circumlocution were tentative suggestions.

variants or corrections written by a hand subsequent to that of the manuscript's original scribe or scholiast, silly mistakes.

When citing passages from other ancient works in the commentary, I only indicate that a word or phrase is the result of conjecture when that is relevant to the purpose for which the passage is cited.

TEXT AND CRITICAL
APPARATUS

INDEX SIGLORVM

CODICES ANTIQVI

- Π¹ P. Colonensis 251, saec. ii med.: 1–11
Π² P. Oxyrhynchus 2093, saec. ii–iii: 51–67, 266–76, 291–307
Π³ P. Oxyrhynchus 1615 (Wellesley College Library, MA), saec.
iv: 694–705, 753–64
Π⁴ P. Berolensis 21208, saec. v–vi: 921–926/7, 950–7

CODICES MEDII AEVI

CONSTANTER CITATI

- L Laurentianus 32.9, saec. x med.
Λ Lugdunensis Batav. Bibl. Publ. Graec. 60A, saec. x med.
(desunt 1–354; cetera mutilata)
K Laurentianus 31.10, saec. xii ex.
A Parisinus gr. 2712, saec. xiv in.
D Neapolitanus II. F. 9, saec. xiv in.
Xr Vindobonensis phil. gr. 161, ann. 1412
Xs Vindobonensis suppl. gr. 71, saec. xiv ex. (desunt 1381–1420)
Zr Marcianus gr. 616, c. ann. 1325

INTERDVM CITATI

- G Laurentianus conv. soppr. 152, ann. 1282
Q Parisinus suppl. gr. 109, saec. xvi
R Vaticanus gr. 2291, saec. xv
C Parisinus gr. 2735, saec. xiii ex.
F Laurentianus 28.25, saec. xiv in.
H Laurentianus 32.40, saec. xiii ex.
J Jenensis Bos. q. 7, saec. xv ex.
Ja Parisinus gr. 2598, saec. xv
Jb Mosquensis gr. 505, saec. xv
N Matritensis gr. 4677, saec. xiii ex. (desunt 1–33)

INDEX SIGLORUM

- O Lugdunensis Batav. Voss. gr. Q 6, saec. xiii ex. (desunt 287–95)
- P Heidelbergensis Palat. gr. 40, saec. xiv (desunt 67–72)
- S Vaticanus Urbinas gr. 141, saec. xiv
- V Marcianus gr. 468, saec. xiv
- Wa Ambrosianus E 103 sup., c. ann. 1275
- Wb Vaticanus gr. 1332, saec. xiii
- Zb Monacensis gr. 500, saec. xv–xvi
- Zc Vaticanus gr. 1333, saec. xiv in. (1–226 aliena manu scripti)
- Zu Pragensis XXV C 26, saec. xiv
- Δ Laurentianus conv. soppr. 41, saec. xiv (desunt 1–559)
- Ambrosianus L 39 sup., saec. xiv in.
- Dresdensis Da. 22, saec. xv in.
- Monacensis gr. 507, saec. xiv–xv
- Mosquensis gr. 504, saec. xiv
- Parisinus gr. 2820, saec. xv

CODICVM FAMILIAE

- ω consensus codicum LKADXrXsZr
- l** consensus codicum LAK
- a** consensus codicum ADXrXsZr vel quot exstant
- Ɑ** codicum ADXrXsZr pars maior, exceptis qui disertim memorantur
- r** consensus codicum GQR

FONTES ALII

- Ch* Choeroboscus
- EM* Etymologicum Magnum
- Eu* Eustathius
- Fa* Favorinus
- Gr* Gregorius Corinthus
- He* Hesychius
- St* Stobaeus
- Su* Etymologicum quod Suda vocatur

INDEX SIGLORUM

SIGLA CETERA

Q ⁱ	lectio in Q a scriba scripta (sed Π ⁱ significat papyrum primam: vide supra)
Q ^r	lectio in Q a rubricatore scripta
Q ²	lectio in Q ab alia manu scripta (sed Π ² significat papyrum secundam: vide supra)
Q ^{ac} , Q ^{pc}	Q ante / post correctionem
Q ^x	Q ante vel post correctionem (incertum utrum)
Q ^t	Q in textu, altera lectione inter lineas vel in margine adscripta
Q ^s	lectio in Q supra lineam scripta
Q ^{rs}	lectio in Q supra lineam a rubricatore scripta
Q ^{gl}	glossema in Q, vel lectio quasi glossema adscripta
^{gl} QRS	glossema in QRS
Q ^{yp}	varia lectio in Q adscripta
Q ^{r^{yp}}	varia lectio in Q a rubricatore adscripta
Q ^m	Q in margine
Q [?]	Q fortasse (vix dispicitur)
(Q)	Q a lectione memorata pusillum discrepat
[Q]	Q legi nequit vel deest
{Q}	lectio in Q quae legi nequit ex indicio colligi potest
Σ	scholiasta, scholia
Σ ^Q	lectio quam disertim testatur scholiasta codicis Q
^{lm} Σ ^Q	lemma scholiastae codicis Q
^c Σ ^Q	lectio interpretando testatur scholiasta codicis Q
^{yp} Σ ^Q	varia lectio adscripta a scholiasta codicis Q
[]	delendum
< >	inserendum
† †	nondum sanatum
add.	addidit, addiderunt
Byz	nescioquis Byzantinus
coni.	coniecit, coniecerunt
del.	delevit, deleverunt
fort.	fortasse
gl.	glossema

INDEX SIGLORUM

interp.	interpunxit, interpunxerunt
nol.	noluit, noluerunt
om.	omittit, omittunt
permut.	permutavit
pos.	posuit, posuerunt
prob.	probavit, probaverunt
suppl.	supplevit, suppleverunt, suppletum
trib.	tribuit, tribuerunt
v.l.	varia lectio
*	littera obscura

CANTICORVM SIGLA

˘	syllaba brevis
—	syllaba longa
×	syllaba anceps
˘	syllaba brevis in elemento longo
˘	brevis in stropha, longa in antistropha
˘	longa in stropha, brevis in antistropha
˘	‘brevis in longo’ in stropha, longa in antistropha
˘	longa in stropha, ‘brevis in longo’ in antistropha
oo	duae syllabae ancipites, quarum una minime longa est
˘	duae breves ex resolutione in loco principi
˘	duae breves in stropha, longa in antistropha
˘	longa in stropha, duae breves in antistropha
⋈	hiatus
	finis vocabuli
	finis periodi
	finis strophae
<i>ad</i>	versus adoneus (—˘˘—×
<i>an</i>	metrum anapaesticum (˘˘˘˘˘˘)
<i>an_λ</i>	˘— pro metro anapaestico
<i>ar</i>	versus aristophaneus (—˘˘—˘—)
<i>cho</i>	choriambus (—˘˘—)

INDEX SIGLORUM

<i>cho dim</i>	versus 00—x—vv— quem alii ‘choriambic dimeter’, alii ‘wilamowitzianum’, alii ‘polyschematist’ vocant
<i>cho enneas</i>	—vv—vv—
<i>cr</i>	creticus (—v—)
<i>D</i>	—vv—vv—
<i>D³</i>	—vv—vv—vv—vv—
<i>δ</i>	dochmius (x—x—)
<i>d</i>	—vv—
<i>da</i>	dactylus (—vv)
<i>dodr</i>	dodrans (—vv—v—)
<i>dodr^B</i>	dodrans cum anaciasi (00—vv—)
<i>e</i>	—v—
<i>enopl</i>	versus enoplius: vide Itsumi (1991–3)
<i>gl</i>	versus glyconeus (00—vv—v—)
<i>hag</i>	versus hagesichoreus (x—vv—v—)
<i>hδ</i>	hypodochmius (—v—v—)
<i>hi</i>	versus hipponacteus (00—vv—v—)
<i>hi^C</i>	versus hipponacteus choriambo auctus (00—vv—vv—v—)
<i>ia</i>	metrum iambicum (x—v—)
<i>[^]ia</i>	—v— pro metro iambico
<i>ia_^</i>	v— pro metro iambico
<i>[^]ia_^</i>	— pro metro iambico
<i>pher</i>	versus pherecrateus (00—vv—)
<i>pher^C</i>	versus pherecrateus choriambo auctus (00—vv—vv—)
<i>reiz</i>	versus reizianus (x—vv—)
<i>tel</i>	versus telesilleus (x—vv—v—)

ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ

ΑΙΑΣ

ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ

Ἀθηνᾶ
Ὀδυσσεύς
Αἴας
Χορὸς Σαλαμινίων ναυτῶν
Τέκμησσα
Ἄγγελος
Τεῦκρος
Μενέλαος
Ἀγαμέμνων

ΚΩΦΟΝ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ

Εὐρυσάκης

ΑΙΑΣ

ΑΘΗΝΑ

Ἄεϊ μέν, ὦ παῖ Λαρτίου, δέδορκά σε
πεῖράν τιν' ἔχθρων ἄρπάσαι θηρώμενον·
καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ σκηναῖς σε ναυτικάῃς ὄρῳ
Αἴαντος, ἔνθα τάξιν ἐσχάτην ἔχει,
πάλαι κυνηγετοῦντα καὶ μετρούμενον 5
ἶχνη τὰ κείνου νεοχάραχθ', ὅπως ἴδης
εἴτ' ἔνδον εἴτ' οὐκ ἔνδον. εὖ δέ σ' ἐκφέρει
κυνὸς Λακαίνης ὥς τις εὖρινος βάσις.
ἔνδον γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἄρτι τυγχάνει, κάρα
στάζων ἰδρώτι καὶ χέρας ξιφοκτόνους. 10
καὶ σ' οὐδὲν εἴσω τῆσδε παπταίνειν πύλης
ἔτ' ἔργον ἐστίν, ἐννέπειν δ' ὅτου χάριν
σπουδὴν ἔθου τήνδ', ὡς παρ' εἰδυίας μάθης.

ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ

ὦ φθέγγμ' Ἀθάνας, φιλτάτης ἐμοὶ θεῶν,
ὡς εὐμαθὲς σου, κἂν ἄποπτος ᾦς ὁμως, 15
φώνημ' ἀκούω καὶ ξυναρπάζω φρενὶ
χαλκοστόμου κώδωνος ὡς Τυρσηνικῆς.
καὶ νῦν ἐπέγνως εὖ μ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ δυσμενεῖ
βάσιν κυκλοῦντ', Αἴαντι τῷ σακεσφόρῳ.
κεῖνον γάρ, οὐδέν' ἄλλον, ἰχνεύω πάλαι. 20
νυκτὸς γὰρ ἡμᾶς τῆσδε πρᾶγος ἄσκοπον
ἔχει περάνας, εἴπερ εἵργασται τάδε·
ἴσμεν γὰρ οὐδέν' τρανές, ἀλλ' ἀλώμεθα·
κἀγὼ θελοντὴς τῷδ' ὑπεζύγην πόνῳ.
ἐφθαρμένας γὰρ ἄρτίως εὐρίσκομεν 25

9 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀνὴρ ὦ 14 φθέγγμ' scripsi post West: φθέγμ' ὦ 15
σου . . . ἄποπτος ὦ *SuEu*: μοι . . . ἄγνωστος Σ ad Aeschinem 22 τάδε] γ'
ὅδε Musgrave 24 θελοντὴς A: θελ- LK a

- λείας ἀπάσας καὶ κατηναρισμένας
 ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῖς ποιμνίων ἐπιστάταις.
 τήνδ' οὖν ἐκείνῳ πᾶς τις αἰτίαν τρέπει.
 καὶ μοί τις ὀπτήρ αὐτὸν εἰσιδὼν μόνον
 πηδῶντα πεδιά σὺν νεορράντῳ ξίφει 30
 φράζει τε κἀδήλωσεν· εὐθέως δ' ἐγὼ
 κατ' ἵχνος ᾄσσω, καὶ τὰ μὲν σημαίνομαι,
 τὰ δ' ἐκπέπληγμαι, κοῦκ ἔχω μαθεῖν ὅπου.
 καιρὸν δ' ἐφήκεις· πάντα γὰρ τὰ τ' οὖν πάρος
 τὰ τ' εἰσέπειτα σῇ κυβερνώμαι χειρί. 35
 Αθ. ἔγνων, Ὀδυσσεῦ, καὶ πάλαι φύλαξ ἔβην
 τῇ σῇ πρόθυμος εἰς ὁδὸν κυναγία.
 Οδ. ἦ καί, φίλη δέσποινα, πρὸς καιρὸν πονῶ;
 Αθ. ὥς ἔστιν ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε τᾶργα ταῦτά σοι.
 Οδ. καὶ πρὸς τί δυσλόγιστον ὦδ' ἦξεν χέρα; 40
 Αθ. χόλῳ βαρυνθεὶς τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὀπλων.
 Οδ. τί δῆτα ποίμναις τήνδ' ἐπεμπίπτει βάσιν;
 Αθ. δοκῶν ἐν ὑμῖν χειρὰ χραίνεσθαι φόνῳ.
 Οδ. ἦ καὶ τὸ βούλευμ' ὥς ἐπ' Ἀργείοις τόδ' ἦν;
 Αθ. κἂν ἐξέπραξεν, εἰ κατημέλησ' ἐγὼ. 45
 Οδ. ποίαισι τόλμαις ταῖσδε καὶ φρενῶν θράσει;
 Αθ. νύκτωρ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς δόλιος ὀρμαῖται μόνος.
 Οδ. ἦ καὶ παρέστη κάπῃ τέρμ' ἀφίκετο;
 Αθ. καὶ δὴ π' ἰ δισσαῖς ἦν στρατηγίσιν πύλαις.
 Οδ. καὶ πῶς ἐπέσχε χεῖρα μαιμῶσαν φόνου; 50
 Αθ. ἐγὼ σφ' ἀπείργω, δυσφόρους ἐπ' ὄμμασι
 γνῶμας βαλοῦσα, τῆς ἀνηκέστου χαρᾶς,

27 ἐπιστάταις *ωSu*: ὑπο— *L^{ac2}* 28 τρέπει *LZr*: νέμει *Ka* 32
 ᾄσσω *Livineii* 'p': αἴσσω *ω* 33 ὅπου *L^{ac}K¹A^{ac}D^rγρ*, *cΣ^L*, *Su*: ὅτου
L^{pc}K^sA^pDXrXsZr, *lmΣ^L*, *Su* [*A^{pc}*] 35 χειρί *ω(Eu)*: φρενί *Σ^LK^{γρ}* 37 τῇ
 σῇ... κυναγία *LXr¹*: τῇ σῇ... κυνηγία *ω*: τῆς σῆς... κυνηγίας *C^sO^{γρ}Δ^s*
 39 τοῦδε τᾶργα] ἔργα τοῦδε *rOVJbS* 40 ὦδ' ἦξεν] ἦμαξεν *Bergk* 44
 βούλευμ' *K^sa*, *cΣ^L*: βούλημ' *LK¹*, *Σ rec. Ar. Plut.* 493 ex antiquis Sophoclis lib-
 ris 45 ἐξέπραξεν *Ka*: —ατ' *L*, *lmΣ^L*: —αξέ γ' *Enger* 46 φρενῶν] χειρῶν
C^{γρ}H^{γρ} 50 μαιμῶσαν *ωSuEu*: μαργῶσαν *H*, *Nauck*: διψῶσαν *L^rγρK^{γρ}*
 51 ἀπείργω *La*: ἀπείρξα *KA^sSu*

- καὶ πρὸς τε ποίμνας ἐκτρέπω σύμμεικτά τε
 λείας ἄδαστα βουκόλων φρουρήματα·
 55 ἔνθ' εἰσπεσὼν ἔκειρε πολύκερων φόνον
 κύκλῳ ῥαχίζων, κἀδόκει μὲν ἔσθ' ὅτε
 δισσοὺς Ἀτρείδας αὐτόχειρ κτείνειν ἔχων,
 ὅτ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ἐμπίτνων στρατηλατῶν.
 ἐγὼ δὲ φοιτῶντ' ἄνδρα μανιάσιν νόσοις
 ὦτρυνον, εἰσέβαλλον εἰς ἔρκη κακά.
 60 κᾶππειτ' ἐπειδὴ τοῦδ' ἐλώφησεν πόνου,
 τοὺς ζῶντας αὖ δεσμοῖσι συνδήσας βοῶν
 ποίμνας τε πάσας εἰς δόμους κομίζεται,
 ὥς ἄνδρας, οὐχ ὥς εὐκερων ἄγραν ἔχων.
 καὶ νῦν κατ' οἴκους συνδέτους ἄκίζεται.
 65 δείξω δὲ καὶ σοὶ τήνδε περιφανῆ νόσον,
 ὥς πᾶσιν Ἀργείοισιν εἰσιδὼν θροῆς.
 θαρσῶν δὲ μίμνε – μηδὲ συμφορὰν δέχου –
 τὸν ἄνδρ' ἐγὼ γὰρ ὁμμάτων ἀποστρόφους
 αὐγὰς ἀπείρξω σὴν πρόσοψιν εἰσιδεῖν.
 70 οὔτος, σὲ τὸν τὰς αἰχμαλωτίδας χέρας
 δεσμοῖς ἀπευθύνοντα προσμολεῖν καλῶ·
 Αἴαντα φωνῶ· στείχε δωμάτων πάρος.
 Οδ. τί δρᾷς, Ἀθάνα; μηδαμῶς σφ' ἔξω κάλει.
 Αθ. οὐ σῖγ' ἀνέξῃ μηδὲ δειλίαν ἀρῇ;
 75 Οδ. μὴ πρὸς θεῶν· ἀλλ' ἔνδον ἀρκείτω μένων.
 Αθ. τί μὴ γένηται; πρόσθεν οὐκ ἀνὴρ ὅδ' ἦν;
 Οδ. ἐχθρὸς γε τῷδε τάνδρῃ καὶ τανῦν ἔτι.
 Αθ. οὐκουν γέλως ἥδιστος εἰς ἐχθροὺς γελᾶν;

53 σύμμεικτα Pearson: σύμμικτα ω 57 δισσοὺς] διοιούς Π² ἔχων]
 παρών L^{γρ} 58 ὅτ' τότ' Π², Blaydes ἐμπίτνων Elmsley: ἐμπιτνῶν a:
 ἐμπίπτων LKZr: ἐμπεσὼν L^{γρ}: προσπίπτων K^s (cum ἄλλω pro ἄλλον):
 ἐμπίτνειν Broadhead post Kayser 60 ἔρκη κακά] ἐρινῦν κακὴν L^{γρ}K^{γρ}
 61 πόνου DXr^{γρ}XsZr: φόνου LKAD^{γρ}: κόπου ⁸¹DXrXs 63 post 64
 praebet Π², omisso etiam 65 64 ὡς] τοὺς Π² 65 ἄκίζεται scripsi
 post West: αἰκ– ω 68–70 del. Reichard 68 sic interp. LKA, Lobeck
 70 ἀπείρξω] ἀπείργω L 74 σφ] om. L 75 ἀρῇ Hesych. s.v., in L
 add. librarius cod. A: ἀρεῖς a: ἄρης L'KZr 79 οὐκουν Markland: οὐκοῦν
 ω notam interrogationis pos. Valckenaer

- Οδ. ἔμοι μὲν ἄρκει τοῦτον ἐν δόμοις μένειν. 80
 Αθ. μεμνηνότε' ἄνδρα περιφανῶς ὀκνεῖς ἰδεῖν;
 Οδ. φρονοῦντα γάρ νιν οὐκ ἂν ἐξέστην ὀκνω.
 Αθ. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ νῦν σε μὴ παρόντ' ἴδη πέλας.
 Οδ. πῶς, εἴπερ ὀφθαλμοῖς γε τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὄρᾳ;
 Αθ. ἐγὼ σκοτώσω βλέφαρα καὶ δεδορκότα. 85
 Οδ. γένοιτο μέντ' ἅν' ἅπαν θεοῦ τεχνωμένου.
 Αθ. σίγα νυν ἔστω καὶ μέν' ὥς κυρεῖς ἔχων.
 Οδ. μένοίμ' ἂν· ἤθελον δ' ἂν ἐκτὸς ὧν τυχεῖν.
 Αθ. ὦ οὔτος, Αἴας· δευτέρον σε προσκαλῶ.
 τί βαιὸν οὕτως ἐντρέπη τῆς συμμάχου; 90

ΑΙΑΣ

- ὦ χαῖρ' Ἀθήνα, χαῖρε Διογενὲς τέκνον,
 ὡς εὔ παρέστης· καὶ σε παγχρύσοις ἐγὼ
 στέψω λαφύροις τῆσδε τῆς ἄγρας χάριν.
 Αθ. καλῶς ἔλεξας. ἀλλ' ἐκείνῳ μοι φράσον,
 ἔβαψας ἔγχος εὔ πρὸς Ἀργείων στρατῶ; 95
 Αἰ. κόμπος πάρεστι κοῦκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι τὸ μή.
 Αθ. ἦ καὶ πρὸς Ἀτρείδαισιν ἦχμασας χέρα;
 Αἰ. ὥστ' οὐποτ' Αἴανθ' οἶδ' ἀτιμάσουσ' ἔτι.
 Αθ. τεθνᾶσιν ἄνδρες, ὡς τὸ σὸν ξυνῆκ' ἐγὼ.
 Αἰ. θανόντες ἤδη τᾶμ' ἀφαιρείσθων ὄπλα. 100
 Αθ. εἶέν· τί γὰρ δὴ παῖς ὁ τοῦ Λαερτίου;
 ποῦ σοι τύχης ἔστηκεν; ἦ πέφευγέ σε;
 Αἰ. ἦ τοῦπίτριπτον κίναδος ἐξήρου μ' ὄπου;
 Αθ. ἔγωγ' Ὀδυσσεά τὸν σὸν ἐνστάτην λέγω.

80 ἐν δόμοις **a**: ἐς δόμους LK **82** γάρ νιν ὠSu: γάρ τᾶν ^{lm}Σ^LK^{ac2}: τᾶν νιν Blaydes: τοί νιν Heimsoeth ὀκνω] ἰδεῖν FHP⁷⁰Ja **85** δεδορκότα] -ότος Markland **89** Αἴας L^pKChGr: Αἴαν L^{ac}aSu **96** μή] μὴ οὐχί ^cΣ^LSu: μὴ οὐ Hermann **97** ἦχμασας] ἦμαξας Reiske, quod pro gl. supra ἔβαψας (95) habent DXrXsZc: hic ἡμάτωςσας gl. praebent KD χέρα **Ka**: χέρα L **98** ὥστ'] ὡς Q, Elmsley οἶδ'] οἶδ' LK, ^cΣ^L **99** ἄνδρες Brunck: ἄνδρες ὠ **101** εἶέν L: εἶεν Ka **102** ἦ LKXrXs: ἦ **a** **104** ἔγωγ'] ἐγὼ δ' GQ^{rac}Hζο punctum post ἔγωγ' del. Bothe

- Α1. ἥδιστος, ὦ δέσποινα, δεσμώτης ἔσω 105
θακεῖ· θανεῖν γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ τί πω θέλω.
- Αθ. πρὶν ἂν τί δράσης ἢ τί κερδάνης πλέον;
Α1. πρὶν ἂν δεθῇς πρὸς κίον' ἐρκείου στέγης—
Αθ. τί δῆτα τὸν δύστηνον ἐργάσῃ κακόν;
Α1. μάστιγι πρῶτον νῶτα φοιनिχθεὶς θάνῃ. 110
Αθ. μὴ δῆτα τὸν δύστηνον ὧδέ γ' ἄκισῃ.
Α1. χαίρειν, Ἀθάννα, τᾶλλ' ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι,
κείνος δὲ τέσει τήνδε κούκ ἄλλην δίκην.
Αθ. σὺ δ' οὖν, ἐπειδὴ τέρψις ἦδε σοὶ τὸ δρᾶν,
χωρῶ χειρί, φείδου μηδὲν ὦνπερ ἐννοεῖς. 115
Α1. χωρῶ πρὸς ἔργον· τοῦτο σοὶ δ' ἐφίεμαι,
τοιάνδ' αἰεὶ μοι σύμμαχον παρεστάναι.
Αθ. ὄρῳ, Ὀδυσσεῦ, τὴν θεῶν ἰσχὺν ὄση;
τούτου τίς ἂν σοὶ τάνδρὸς ἢ προνούστερος
ἢ δρᾶν ἀμείνων ἡύρεθῃ τὰ καίρια; 120
Οδ. ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδέν' οἶδ'· ἐποικτίρω δέ νιν
δύστηνον ἔμπας, καίπερ ὄντα δυσμενῇ,
ὀθούνεκ' ἄτῃ συγκατέζευκται κακῇ,
οὐδὲν τὸ τούτου μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦμὸν σκοπῶν.
ὄρῳ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν 125
εἶδωλ' ὅσοιπερ ζῶμεν ἢ κούφην σκιάν.
Αθ. τοιαῦτα τοίνυν εἰσορῶν ὑπέρκοπον
μηδὲν ποτ' εἴπησ' αὐτὸς εἰς θεοὺς ἔπος,
μηδ' ὄγκον ἄρῃ μηδέν', εἴ τινος πλέον
ἢ χειρὶ βρίθεις ἢ μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει. 130
ὥς ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν

108 ἐρκείου Α², Burges: ἐρκίου LK^aSu **111** δύστηνον] δειλαιον Wolff
ἄκισῃ scripsi post West: αἰκ- ὦ **112** ἐγὼ σ' a: ἐγωγέ σ' LKZr: ἐγωγ'
Schmidt [A] **113** τέσει Nauck: τίσει ὦ **114** σὺ δ' οὖν] οὐκοῦν Jack-
son ἦδε LKa: ὧδε D^{gl}: ἦδ' ἐν Jackson **115** ἐννοεῖς] ἐννέπεις L^{yp}K^{yp}
116 τοῦτο σοὶ δ'] σοὶ δὲ τοῦτ' Bergk **119** ἂν σοὶ τάνδρὸς LKaSu: ἀνδρῶν
ἄλλος D ἢ LKZrSu: ἦν a **120** ἡύρεθῃ Dindorf: εὐ- ὦ Su **121** ἐποικ-
τίρω Nauck: ἐποικτεῖρω ὦ Su **122** ἔμπας Wesseling e Σ: ἔμπης ὦ Su
129 ἄρῃ LKAD^{ac}XrSt: ἄρης D^{tpc}XsZr **130** βάθει LKA^sDZrStSu: βάρει
A^tXrXs^s

ἅπαντα τάνθρώπεια· τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας
θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακοὺς.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

Τελαμώνιε παῖ, τῆς ἀμφιρύτου
Σαλαμῖνος ἔχων βάθρον ἀγχίαλον, 135
σὲ μὲν εὖ πράσσουντ' ἐπιχαίρω·
σὲ δ' ὅταν πληγὴ Διὸς ἢ ζαμενῆς
λόγος ἐκ Δαναῶν κακόθρους ἐπιβῇ,
μέγαν ὄκνον ἔχω καὶ πεφόβημαι
πτηνῆς ὡς ὄμμα πελείας. 140
ὡς καὶ τῆς νῦν φθιμένης νυκτὸς
μεγάλοι θόρυβοι κατέχουσ' ἡμᾶς
ἐπὶ δυσκλείᾳ, σὲ τὸν ἵππομανῆ
λειμῶν' ἐπιβάντ' ὀλέσαι Δαναῶν
βοτὰ καὶ λείαν, 145
ἥπερ δορίληπτος ἔτ' ἦν λοιπή,
κτείνοντ' αἰθῶνι σιδήρῳ.
τοιούσδε λόγους ψιθύρους πλάσσω
εἰς ὧτα φέρει πᾶσιν Ὀδυσσεύς,
καὶ σφόδρα πείθει· περὶ γὰρ σοῦ νῦν 150
εὐπείστα λέγει, καὶ πᾶς ὁ κλυῶν
τοῦ λέξαντος χαίρει μᾶλλον
τοῖς σοῖς ἄχεσιν καθυβρίζων.
τῶν γὰρ μεγάλων ψυχῶν ἰεῖς
οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι· κατὰ δ' ἂν τις ἔμοῦ 155
τοιαῦτα λέγων οὐκ ἂν πείθοι.
πρὸς γὰρ τὸν ἔχονθ' ὁ φθόνος ἔρπει.
καίτοι σμικροὶ μεγάλων χωρὶς
σφαλερὸν πύργου ῥῦμα πέλονται·

135 ἀγχίαλον H, Bothe: -άλου *ωSu* **146** λοιπή] κοινή G¹VP, ^g1FNO, Herwerden **149** πᾶσιν] πάντων L, quo recepto Ὀδυσσεύς Nauck **151**
εὐπείστα L^xKa: εὐπίστα rZc κλυῶν Kamerbeek: κλύων *ωSu* **155**
ἀμάρτοι] -η K: -οις *Su*: -οι* L **159** σφαλερὸν] χαλεπὸν *Su*

μετὰ γὰρ μεγάλων βαιὸς ἄριστ' ἄν καὶ μέγας ὀρθοῖθ' ὑπὸ μικροτέρων. ἀλλ' οὐ δυνατὸν τοὺς ἀνοήτους τούτων γνώμας προδιδάσκειν. ὑπὸ τοιούτων ἀνδρῶν θορυβῇ χῆμεῖς οὐδὲν σθένομεν πρὸς ταῦτ' ἀπαλέξασθαι σοῦ χωρὶς, ἄναξ. ἀλλ' ὅτε γὰρ δὴ τὸ σὸν ὄμμ' ἀπέδραν, παταγοῦσιν ἅπερ πτηνῶν ἀγέλαι· μέγαν αἰγυπιὸν <δ'> ὑποδείσαντες τάχ' ἄν, ἐξαίφνης εἰ σὺ φανείης, σιγῇ πτήξειαν ἄφωνοι.	160 165 170
ἦ ῥά σε Ταυροπόλα Διὸς Ἄρτεμις — ὦ μέγала φάτις, ὦ μᾶτερ αἰσχύνας ἐμᾶς — ῶρμασε πανδάμους ἐπὶ βοῦς ἀγελαίας, ἦ ποῦ τινος νίκας ἀκαρπώτου χάριν, ἦ ῥα κλυτῶν ἐνάρων ψευσθεῖς' ἁδώροισ ἐῖτ' ἐλαφβολίαις; ἦ χαλκοθώραξ εἴ τιν' Ἐνυάλιος μομφὰν ἔχων ξυνοῦ δορὸς ἐννυχίοις μαχαναῖς ἐτείσατο λῶβαν; οὔποτε γὰρ φρενόθεν γ' ἐπ' ἀριστερά, παῖ Τελαμῶνος, ἔβας τόσσον ἐν ποιμναῖς πίτνων· ἦκοι γὰρ ἄν θεία νόσος· ἀλλ' ἀπερύκοι	[str. 175 180/1 181/2 [ant. 185

161 μικροτέρων LKSt: συμ- **a**(St)Eu **168** ἅπερ L^{ac}K^{ac}D^{ac}?, Σ¹·: ἅτε L^{pc}K^{pc} **a**, ^{lm}Σ^o: ἅτερ G^{ac}O^{ipc} **169** <δ'> Dawes ὑποδείσαντες L^{pc}**a**, Σ^p: ὑποδδ- {L^{ac}}K **176** ἦ Zu, Lachmann et Reisig: ἦ ὦ ἀκαρπώτου Johnson: -ωτον ὦ **177** ἦ ῥα] ἦρα Hermann **178** ψευσθεῖς' ἁδώροισ Stephanus: -σα δ- ὦ εἴτ] ἦ 'π' Blydes ἐλαφβολίαις Linwood: -είαις LK: ἐλαφβολίαις **a** **179** εἰ Elmsley: ἦ ὦ: σοί Reiske et Pierson **181/2** μαχαναῖς] μη- ὦ ἐτείσατο Nauck: ἐτίσατο ὦ **183** γὰρ ὦSu: τᾶν Dawe: γ' ἄν Lloyd-Jones et Wilson **185** τόσσον LK{Xs^{ac}}: τόσσον ADXrXs^{pc}ZrSu ποίμναις Zc, Triclinius: -αῖσι ὦSu πίτνων K, Elmsley: -ῶν ASu: utroque accentu L: -εῖν Hartung

καὶ Ζεὺς κακὰν καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀργείων φάτιν. εἰ δ' ὑποβαλλόμενοι κλέπτουσι μύθους οἱ μεγάλοι βασιλῆς χῶ τᾷς ἀσώτου Σισυφιδᾶν γενεᾷς, μὴ μή, ἄναξ, ἔθ' ὧδ' ἐφάλοισ κλισίαις ὄμμ' ἔχων κακὰν φάτιν ἄρη.	190 191/2 192/3
ἀλλ' ἄνα ἐξ ἐδράνων ὅπου μακραίωνι στηρίζη ποτὲ τῷδ' ἀγωνίῳ σχολᾷ ἄταν οὐρανίαν φλέγων. ἐχθρῶν δ' ὕβρις ὧδ' ἀτάρβητα ὀρμᾶται ἐν εὐανέμοις βάσσαις, πάντων καχαζόντων γλώσσαις βαρυάλγητα· ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος ἔστακεν.	194a [ep. 194b 195 199/200 200

ΤΕΚΜΗΣΣΑ

ναὸς ἄρωγοὶ τῆς Αἴαντος, γενεᾷς χθονίων ἀπ' Ἐρεχθεϊδῶν, ἔχομεν στοναχὰς οἱ κηδόμενοι τοῦ Τελαμῶνος τηλόθεν οἴκου. νῦν γὰρ ὁ δεινὸς μέγας ὠμοκρατῆς Αἴας θολερῶ κεῖται χειμῶνι νοσήσας. Χο. τί δ' ἐνήλλακται τῆς ἡμερίας	205
--	-----

189 βασιλῆς {L^{ac}}: -ης Zc: -ῆες V: -εῖς KaSu **190** χῶ τᾷς Byz: ἡ τᾷς ωSu: ἡ παῖς Johnson Σισυφιδᾶν] -ίδα L^{YP}: -ίδας Lobeck **191/2** μὴ μή Blaydes: μὴ μὴ μ' ωSu: μὴ μ' GOV **192/3** ὄμμ' ἔχων] ἐμμένων Reiske ἄρη LAXrXs: ἄρης KDZr **195** ποτὲ ωSu: ποτὶ Zc, Ritschl ἀγωνίῳ LKAXrXs: -ίᾳ DZr **197** ἀτάρβητα] -ἠθ' Hermann: -ήτως ^gLDStuZö: -ητος codd. pauci teste Brunck **198** ὀρμᾶται Triclinius: ὀρμᾷ D^{ac}Stu: ὀρμᾷτ' LKa **199** καχαζόντων Dindorf: καγχ- KaSu: βακχ- L^{ac}: βαγχ- L^{pc} **199/200** βαρυάλγητα Zb: -τ' ω **202** γενεᾷς] γενεᾷ Reiske Ἐρεχθεϊδῶν K^sXs: -ᾶν ω **205** μέγας OVS, Bentley: ὁ μέγας ω **208** ἡμερίας H, Jebb: ἄμ- ω: ἄμ- C^{ac}PZc: ἀημερίας L^{YP}

- νύξ <ϞϞϞϞ> ἦδε βάρος;
 παῖ τοῦ Φρυγίου Τελλεύταντος, 210
 λέγ', ἐπεὶ σε λέχος δουριάλων
 στέρξασαν ἔχει θούριος Αἴας·
 ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν αἰδρις ὑπείποις.
- Τεκ. πῶς δῆτα λέγω λόγον ἄρρητον;
 θανάτῳ γὰρ ἴσον πάθος ἐκπέυση. 215
 μανίᾳ γὰρ ἄλους ἦμιν ὁ κλεινὸς
 νύκτερος Αἴας ἀπελωβήθη.
 τοιαῦτ' ἂν ἴδοις σκηνῆς ἔνδον
 χειροδάκτυλα σφάγι' αἰμοβαφῇ,
 κείνου χρηστήρια τάνδρος. 220
- Χο. οἷαν ἐδήλωσας ἀνδρὸς αἴθονος 221/2 [str.
 ἀγγελίαν ἄτλατον οὐδὲ φευκτάν, 222/3
 τῶν μεγάλων Δαναῶν ὑπο κληζομένην, 224/5
 τὰν ὁ μέγας μῦθος ἀέξει. 226
 ὦμοι, φοβοῦμαι τὸ προσέρπον. περίφαντος ἀνὴρ 227/8
 θανεῖται, παραπλήκτῳ χερὶ συγκατακτὰς 229/30
 κελαινοῖς ξίφεσιν βοτὰ καὶ 231/2
 βοτῆρας ἵππονώμας. 232
- Τεκ. ὦμοι· κεῖθεν κεῖθεν ἄρ' ἡμῖν
 δεσμῶτιν ἄγων ἤλυθε ποίμνην·
 ὦν τὰ μὲν εἶσω σφαζ' ἐπὶ γαίᾳς, 235
 τὰ δὲ πλευροκοπῶν δίχ' ἀνερρήγνυ.

209 lacunam pos. Bruhn **210** Φρυγίου] -οιο Jaeger Τελλεύταντος
 AXr, Bentley: Τελεύ- LK^a: <σν> Τελεύ- Porson **211** δουριάλων
 Livineii 'V': δορι- vel δορυ- ωSu **212** στέρξασαν ἔχει L^{ac}K, ^{yp}Σ: στέρξας
 ἀνέχει L^{pc}aSu **215** πάθος LⁱKa: βάρος L^s **216** ἦμιν Hermann: ἡμῖν
 A, Livineii 'pV': ἡμῖν ωSu **221/2** ἀνδρὸς ωSuEu: ἀνέρος Hermann
 αἴθονος L^{pc}K: αἴθοπος L^{ac}L^sADXsSu: αἴθωνος XrZrEu **222/3** φευκ-
 τάν L^{pc}K^{pc}a: -ήν C: -όν L^{ac}K^{ac}Su: φερτάν P **224/5** μεγάλων] μελέων
 Lloyd-Jones et Wilson ὑπο Par. gr. 2820: ὑπὸ K, Stephanus e Σ: ὑπο-
 La **227/8** ὦμοι LK: ὦμοι DSu: οἶμοι a ἀνὴρ Hermann: ἀν- ω
229/30 παραπλήκτῳ ωSu: -άκτῳ H^{ts}, Blaydes **232** ἵππονώμας L^{ac2},
 Porson: -νόμας K^{ac}: -νόμους L (fort. p.c.), K^{pc}a **233** ὦμοι LK: ὦμοι
 a **234** ποίμνην Ellendt: -αν ω **235** τὰ Triclinius: τὸ Xs: τὸν Zr: τὴν
 LK^a εἶσω Triclinius: ἔσω LKADXr: om. XsZr 'σφαζ' Jb, Bentley: σφάζ'
 KADXr(Zr): σφάζ' L(Xs) **236** τὰ Triclinius: τὰς ω

- δύο δ' ἄργίποδας κριούς ἀνελών
 τοῦ μὲν κεφαλὴν καὶ γλῶσσαν ἄκραν
 ῥίπτει θερίσας, τὸν δ' ὀρθὸν ἄνω
 κίονι δήσας 240
 μέγαν ἵπποδέτην ῥυτῆρα λαβὼν
 παίει λιγυρᾷ μάστιγι διπλῇ,
 κακὰ δενδάζων ῥήμαθ', ἃ δαίμων
 κοῦδεις ἀνδρῶν ἐδίδασεν. 244
 Χο. ὦρα τιν' ἤδη κάρα καλύμμασι 245/6 [ant.
 κρυψάμενον ποδοῖν κλοπὰν ἀρέσθαι, 246/7
 ἣ θοὸν εἰρεσίας ζυγὸν ἐζόμενον 248/9
 ποντοπόρῳ ναῖ μεθεῖναι. 250
 τοίας ἐρέσσουσιν ἀπειλὰς δικρατεῖς Ἀτρεΐδαι 251/2
 καθ' ἡμῶν· πεφόβημαι λιθόλευστον Ἄρη 253/4
 ξυναλγείν μετὰ τοῦδε τυπεῖς, 255/6
 τὸν αἴσ' ἄπλατος ἴσχει. 256
 Τεκ. οὐκέτι· λαμπρᾶς γὰρ ὑπὸ στεροπῆς
 ἄξας ὀξὺς νότος ὥς λήγει.
 καὶ νῦν φρόνιμος νέον ἄλγος ἔχει·
 τὸ γὰρ ἐσλεύσσειν οἰκεῖα πάθη, 260
 μηδενὸς ἄλλου παραπράξαντος,
 μεγάλας ὀδύνas ὑποτείνει.
 Χο. ἀλλ' εἰ πέπαυται, κάρτ' ἂν εὐτυχεῖν δοκῶ·
 φρούδου γὰρ ἤδη τοῦ κακοῦ μείων λόγος.
 Τεκ. πότερα δ' ἂν, εἰ νέμοι τις αἴρεσιν, λάβοις, 265
 φίλους ἀνιῶν αὐτὸς ἡδονὰς ἔχειν,
 ἣ κοινὸς ἐν κοινοῖσι λυπεῖσθαι ξυνών;
 Χο. τό τοι διπλάζον, ὦ γύναι, μεῖζον κακόν.
 Τεκ. ἡμεῖς ἄρ' οὐ νοσοῦντος ἀτῶμεσθα νῦν.

239 ῥίπτει Jb, Elmsley: ῥίπτει ω **245/6** ἤδη KAXsEu: ἤδη τοι LDXrZr
 κάρα Triclinius: κῤατα (vel κῤά-) ωEu καλύμμασι] -ατι Eu **251/2**
 ἐρέσσουσιν ωSu: ἐρείσουσιν Wieseler **253/4** Ἄρη LKAXr: Ἄρην a
256 ἄπλατος] -αστος ZrSu **257** ὑπὸ Paehler: ἄτερ ω στεροπῆς Din-
 dorf: στεροπᾶς ωSu: ἀστεροπᾶς (sine ἄτερ) Su **258** ἄξας Livineii 'p': ἀΐξας
 ω **260** ἐσλεύσσειν] εἰς- RC **269** post ἡμεῖς add. γ' HV νοσοῦντος
 Hermann: -εξ ω

- Χο. πῶς τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; οὐ κάτοιδ' ὅπως λέγεις. 270
- Τεκ. ἀνὴρ ἐκείνος, ἥνικ' ἦν ἐν τῇ νόσῳ,
αὐτὸς μὲν ἦδεθ' οἷσιν εἶχετ' ἐν κακοῖς,
ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς φρονοῦντας ἡνία ξυνών·
νῦν δ' ὥς ἔλῃξε κἀνέπνευσε τῆς νόσου,
κεῖνός τε λύπη πᾶς ἐλήλათαι κακῇ 275
ἡμεῖς θ' ὁμοίως οὐδὲν ἦσσον ἢ πάρος.
ἄρ' ἐστὶ ταῦτα δις τόσ' ἐξ ἀπλῶν κακά;
- Χο. ξύμφημι δὴ σοι καὶ δέδοικα μὴ κ' θεοῦ
πληγὴ τις ἦκει. πῶς γάρ, εἰ πεπαυμένος
μηδὲν τι μᾶλλον ἢ νοσῶν εὐφραίνεται; 280
- Τεκ. ὥς ὧδ' ἐχόντων τῶνδ' ἐπίστασθαί σε χρή.
- Χο. τίς γάρ ποτ' ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ προσέπτατο;
δήλωσον ἡμῖν τοῖς ξυναλγοῦσιν τύχας.
- Τεκ. ἅπαν μαθήσῃ τοῦργον, ὥς κοινωνὸς ὢν.
κεῖνος γὰρ ἄκρας νυκτός, ἥνιχ' ἔσπεροι 285
λαμπτήρες οὐκέτ' ἦθον, ἄμφηκες λαβῶν
ἐμαίετ' ἔγχος ἐξόδους ἔρπειν κενάς.
κἀγὼ ὑπιπλήσσω καὶ λέγω, “τί χρῆμα δρᾶς,
Αἴας; τί τήνδ' ἄκλητος οὔθ' ὑπ' ἀγγέλων
κληθεὶς ἀφορμᾶς πεῖραν οὔτε του κλυῶν 290
σάλπιγγος; ἀλλὰ νῦν γε πᾶς εὐδαι στρατός.”
ὁ δ' εἶπε πρὸς με βαί', αἰεὶ δ' ὑμνούμενα·
“γύναι, γυναιξὶ κόσμον ἢ σιγὴ φέρει.”
κἀγὼ μαθοῦσ' ἔληξ', ὁ δ' ἐσσύθη μόνος.
καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖ μὲν οὐκ ἔχω φράζειν πάθας· 295
ἔσω δ' ἐσῆλθε συνδέτους ἄγων ὁμοῦ

271 ἀνὴρ Hermann: ἀνὴρ ὦ 273 φρονοῦντας ὠSu: βλέποντας L^{γρ}
274 κἀνέπνευσε ὠSu: κατέπτασε fort. D^{ac}, QR: κατέπτασε G 279 ἦκει
Zr, Elmsley: -ῆ Su: -οι LK^a 283 τύχας] -αις Linwood 286 οὐκέτ'
ἦθον ὠSu: ἦθοντ' οὐκέτ' Pearson 289 Αἴας] Αἴαν Su ἄκλητος] ἄκαιρος
Herwerden οὔθ' οὐδ' Su 290 ἀφορμᾶς LKAD^{Xs} Su: ἐφ- XrZr κλυῶν
Kamerbeek: κλυῶν ὠSu 293 γυναιξὶ Π^{2,8} ὠSiSuEu: γυναικὶ Π^{2,1}, Arist.
295 ἐκεῖ μὲν Π² ὠ: μὲν ἔνδον Su οὐχ ἔχω φράζειν JJ^a: οὐχ ἔχω λέγειν ὠSu:
οὐ λέγειν ἔχω G πάθας ὠSu: τύχας C^{sl}

ταύρους, κύνας βοτῆρας, εὐερόν τ' ἄγραν.
 καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἠϋχένιζε, τοὺς δ' ἄνω τρέπων
 ἔσφαζε κάρρράχιζε, τοὺς δὲ δεσμίους
 ῥηκίζεθ' ὥστε φῶτας ἐν ποίμναις πίτνων. 300
 τέλος δ' ἀπάξας διὰ θυρῶν σκιᾶ τινι
 λόγους ἀνέσπα, τοὺς μὲν Ἀτρειδῶν κατά,
 τοὺς δ' ἀμφ' Ὀδυσσεῖ, συντιθείς γέλων πολύν,
 ὄσσην κατ' αὐτῶν ὕβριν ἐκτείσαιτ' ἰών·
 κᾶπειτ' ἐπάξας αὖθις ἐς δόμους πάλιν 305
 ἔμφρων μόλις πῶς ξύν χρόνῳ καθίσταται.
 καὶ πλῆρες ἄτης ὥς διοπτεύει στέγος,
 παίσας κάρα θῶνυξεν· ἐν δ' ἔρειπίοις
 νεκρῶν ἐρειφθεὶς ἕζετ' ἀρνείου φόνου,
 κόμην ἀπρίξ ὄνουσι συλλαβὼν χερί. 310
 καὶ τὸν μὲν ἦστο πλεῖστον ἄφθογγος χρόνον·
 ἔπειτ' ἐμοὶ τὰ δειν' ἐπηπείλησ' ἔπη,
 εἰ μὴ φανοίην πᾶν τὸ συντυχὸν πάθος.
 [κάνηρετ' ἐν τῷ πράγματος κυροὶ ποτε.]
 κἀγώ, φίλοι, δείσασα τοῦξειργασμένον 315
 ἔλεξα πᾶν ὅσονπερ ἐξηπιστάμην.
 ὁ δ' εὐθύς ἐξώμωξεν οἰμωγὰς λυγράς,
 ὅς οὔ ποτ' αὐτοῦ πρόσθεν εἰσήκουσ' ἐγώ.
 πρὸς γὰρ κακοῦ τε καὶ βαρυψύχου γόους
 τοιούσδ' αἶε ποτ' ἀνδρὸς ἐξηγεῖτ' ἔχειν· 320
 ἀλλ' ἀψόφητος ὀξέων κωκυμάτων
 ὑπεστέναζε ταῦρος ὥς βρυχώμενος.
 νῦν δ' ἐν τοιᾷδε κείμενος κακῇ τύχῃ

297 ταύρους Π²ω: -οις Reiske εὐερον Schneidewin: εὐκερων Π²ω **299**
 ἔσφαζε **Ka***Su*: ἔσφαξε L κάρρράχιζε] κάρα- Π²LK **300** πίτνων] πιτνῶν
 Α **301** ἀπάξας Π²K: ὑπ- Α^xXrXs: ἐπ- Α^sDZr [L] **304** ἐκτείσαιτ'
 Nauck: ἐκτίσαιτ' ω **305** ἐπάξας **Ka**: ἐν- Π²: ἀπ- L^{pc} (ἀπάξαις L^{ac}):
 ὑπ- Ambros. L 39 sup. **308** θῶνυξεν Bentley: θῶνυξεν ω*Su* **309** ἐρει-
 φθεὶς AXrXs: ἐριφθεὶς KD(*Su*): ἐρεφθεὶς L²: ἐρεισθεὶς L^{yp}*Su* **310** χερὶ]
 -ός K^s: -οῖν *Su*, S, Mosq. gr. 504 **313** φανοίην Xr, Pierson et Toup:
 φανείην LKADXs: φανείη Zr **[314]** del. Nauck: habent ω*Su* πράγ-
 ματος LKAXrXs{Zr^{ac}}*Su*: -τι DZr^{1pc} κυροὶ L*Su*: -εἰ **Ka**

- ἄσιτος ἀνὴρ, ἄποτος, ἐν μέσοις βοτοῖς
 σιδηροκμήσιν ἥσυχος θακεῖ πεσών. 325
 καὶ δῆλός ἐστιν ὥς τι δρασεῖον κακόν.
 [τοιαῦτα γὰρ πῶς καὶ λέγει κῶδύρεται.]
 ἀλλ', ὦ φίλοι, τούτων γὰρ οὐνεκ' ἐστάλην,
 ἀρήξατ' εἰσελθόντες, εἰ δύνασθέ τι.
 φίλων γὰρ οἱ τοιοῖδε νικῶνται λόγοις. 330
- Χο. Τέκμησσα, δεινοῖς, παῖ Τελεύταντος, λέγεις
 ἡμῖν τὸν ἄνδρα διαπεφοιβάσθαι κακοῖς.
- Αἰ. ἰὼ μοί μοι.
- Τεκ. τάχ', ὥς ἔοικε, μᾶλλον· ἢ οὐκ ἠκούσατε
 Αἴαντος οἶαν τήνδε θύσσει βοήν; 335
- Αἰ. ἰὼ μοί μοι.
- Χο. ἀνὴρ ἔοικεν ἢ νοσεῖν ἢ τοῖς πάλαι
 νοσήμασι ξυνοῦσι λυπεῖσθαι παρών.
- Αἰ. ἰὼ παῖ παῖ.
- Τεκ. οἴμοι τάλαιν'· Εὐρύσακες, ἀμφὶ σοὶ βοῶ.
 τί ποτε μενοινᾷ; ποῦ ποτ' εἶ; τάλαιν' ἐγώ. 340
- Αἰ. Τεῦκρον καλῶ. ποῦ Τεῦκρος; ἢ τὸν εἰσαεῖ
 λεηλατήσῃ χρόνον; ἐγὼ δ' ἀπόλλυμαι.
- Χο. ἀνὴρ φρονεῖν ἔοικεν. ἀλλ' ἀνοίγετε.
- τάχ' ἂν τιν' αἰδῶ κάπ' ἔμοι βλέψας λάβοι. 345
- Τεκ. ἰδού, διοίγω· προσβλέπειν δ' ἔξεστί σοι
 τὰ τοῦδε πράγῃ, καὺτὸς ὥς ἔχων κυρεῖ.
- Αἰ. ἰὼ 348 [str. 1
 φίλοι ναυβάται, μόνοι ἐμῶν φίλων, 348/9
 μόνοι ἔτ' ἐμμένοντες ὀρθῶ νόμῳ, 349/50
 ἴδεσθέ μ' οἶον ἄρτι κῦ— 350

324 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀνὴρ ὦ [327] del. Nauck 328 τούτων] τού-
 του Xs οὐνεκ' εἶνεκ' KD 330 λόγοις Xs^{yp} St: φίλοι ὦ 331 δεινοῖς
 Bentley: δεινά ὦ Τελεύταντος] Τελλ- Xr^s, fort. D^{ac} 332 διαπε-
 φοιβάσθαι Ka: -ᾶσθαι LDZr 337 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀνὴρ ὦ 338 νοσή-
 μασι ξυνοῦσι... παρών]-σιν παρ-... ξυν- Blaydes παρών] πάλιν Nauck
 339 ἰὼ παῖ παῖ varie turbant ὦ 340 οἴμοι scripsi: ὦμοι LKA: ὦμοι a
 342 ἢ G^{pc} Q^{pc} RNP, Brunck: ἢ LKa 344 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀνὴρ ὦ 345
 ἔμοι] ἐμὲ Herwerden 349/50 ἔτ' Reiske: τ' ὦ: om. Su

- μα φοινίας ὑπὸ ζάλης 351/2
ἀμφίδρομον κυκλεῖται. 353
- Χο. οἴμ' ὡς ἔοικας ὀρθὰ μαρτυρεῖν ἄγαν.
δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦργον ὡς ἀφροντίστως ἔχει. 355
- Αἰ. ἰὼ 356 [ant. 1
γένος ναῖας ἄρωγόν τέχνας, 356/7
ἄλιον ὃς ἐπέβας ἐλίσσων πλάταν, 357/8
σέ τοι σέ τοι μόνον δέδορ— 359
κα πημονὰν ἐπαρκέσονται. 359/60
ἀλλὰ με συνδάξιν. 361
- Χο. εὖφημα φώνει· μὴ κακὸν κακῷ διδούς
ἄκος πλέον τὸ πῆμα τῆς ἄτης τίθει.
- Αἰ. ὀρῶς τὸν θρασύν, τὸν εὐκάρδιον, [str. 2
τὸν ἐν δαίσις ἄτρεστον μάχας, 365
ἐν ἀφόβοις με θηρσί δεινὸν χέρας;
ᾧμοι γέλωτος· οἷον ὑβρίσθην ἄρα.
- Τεκ. μή, δέσποτ' Αἴας, λίσσομαί σ', αὐδα τάδε.
- Αἰ. οὐκ ἐκτός; οὐκ ἄψορρον ἐκνεμῇ πόδα;
αἰαῖ αἰαῖ. 370
- Τεκ. ὦ πρὸς θεῶν ὕπεικε καὶ φρόνησον εὔ.
- Αἰ. ὦ δύσμορος, ὃς χερὶ μὲν
μεθῆκα τοὺς ἀλάστορας,
ἐν δ' ἐλίκεσσι βουσί καὶ
κλυτοῖς πεσὼν αἰπολίοις 375
ἐρεμνὸν αἶμ' ἔδευσα.
- Χο. τί δῆτ' ἂν ἀλγοίης ἐπ' ἐξειργασμένοις;
οὐ γὰρ γένοιτ' ἂν ταυθ' ὅπως οὐχ ὧδ' ἔχοι.

351/2 ὑπὸ LK^a Su: ἀπὸ fort. A^{ac} **357/8** ἄλιον Hermann: ἀλίαν ὦ
359/60 πημονὰν Reiske: ποιμένων ὦ **365** δαίσις LK^a Su: -αῖς DXrXsZr
ἄτρεστον LK^{yp} a Su: ἄτρεπτον Kⁱ μάχας Blaydes: μάχαις ὦ Su **367**
ᾧμοι L: οἴμοι Ka ἄρα] τάλας F^{yp} **369** alterum οὐκ] del. Neue
ἐκνεμῇ] -εῖς K^{pc} D, Blaydes **370** αἶ vel αἶ quater D^{ac} Zr: ter IAD^{pc} XrXs:
sexies QH: septies Zc **371** Tecmessae trib. K^{ac}, Hermann: choro LK^{ipc} a
372 ὦ RF: ὦ ὦ: ἰὼ Triclinius, Q^{ac2} χερὶ μὲν Hermann: χερσὶ μὲν ὦ:
χεροῖν Triclinius **378** ἔχοι Herwerden (cf. Σ): ἔχη C^{ipc}, Valckenaer: ἔχει
Chalcondylas: ἔχειν ὦ Su

- A1. ἰὼ πάνθ' ὀρώων, ἀπάντων τ' ἀεὶ [ant. 2
κακῶν ὄργανον, τέκνον Λαρτίου, 380
κακοπινέστατόν τ' ἄλημα στρατοῦ,
ἧ που πολὺν γέλωθ' ὑφ' ἡδονῆς ἄγεις.
- Xo. ξὺν τῷ θεῷ πᾶς καὶ γελαῖ κώδύρεται.
- A1. ἴδοιμι <δῆ> νιν, καίπερ ὦδ' ἀτώμενος —
ἰὼ μοί μοι. 385
- Xo. μηδὲν μέγ' εἵπησ' οὐχ ὀρᾷς ἴν' εἴ κακοῦ;
- A1. ὦ Ζεῦ προγόνων προπάτορ,
πῶς ἂν τὸν αἰμυλώτατον,
ἐχθρὸν ἄλημα, τοὺς τε δισσ—
ἄρχας ὀλέσσας βασιλῆς, 390
τέλος θάνοιμι καὐτός;
- Τεκ. ὅταν κατεύχη ταῦθ', ὁμοῦ κἄμοι θανεῖν
εὖχου· τί γὰρ δεῖ ζῆν με σοῦ τεθνηκότος;
- A1. <ἰὼ> 394a [str. 3
σκότος, ἐμὸν φάος, 394b
Ἕρεβος ὦ φαεννότατον, ὡς ἐμοί, 395
ἔλεσθ' ἔλεσθέ μ' οἰκήτορα,
ἔλεσθέ μ' οὔτε γὰρ θεῶν γένος 397/8
οὔθ' ἀμερίων ἔτ' ἄξιος 398/9
βλέπειν τιν' εἰς ὄνησιν ἀνθρώπων. 399/400
ἀλλὰ μ' ἅ Διὸς 401a
ἀλκίμα θεὸς 401b
†ὀλέθριον† ἄκίζει.

379 πάνθ' ὀρώων] πᾶν θ' ὀρώων Xs, Elmsley: πάντα δρώων Valckenaer ἀπάντων τ' ἀεὶ Ka: ἀπάντων ἀεὶ F^{ac}VJ: πάντων ἀεὶ L: ἀπάντων τ' αἰών C^{pc}F^{ac}N^oO^{pc} **380** Λαρτίου R: Λαερτίου ωSu **382** ἄγεις ωSu: ἔχεις RF^{gl}, Herwerden **383** τῷ] τοι Schneidewin **384** δῆ Triclinius: om. ωSu: ἐγὼ Elmsley: τοι Hermann aposiopesin indicat Kamerbeek **387** ὦ] ἰὼ Triclinius προπάτορ K^{pc}XrXs^{rs}: —τωρ LK^{ac}ADXs^tZr: πάτερ cod. teste Triclinio **390** ὀλέσσας Triclinius: ὀλέσας ωΛSu βασιλῆς LK: —εἰς aSu **396** ἔλεσθ' Triclinius: ἔλεσθέ μ' laSu ἔλεσθέ μ' lAD^{ip}XrXsSu: ἔλεσθ' D^{ac}Zr **399/400** ὄνησιν ωΛSu: ὄνασιν Livineius **401a** Διὸς <γ> Triclinius **402** ὀλέθριον ωSu: ὀλέθρι Dindorf: οὐλιον Wunder ἄκίζει Willink post West: αἰκ— ωSu

	ποῖ τις οὖν φύγη;	
	ποῖ μολῶν μενῶ;	
	εἰ τὰ μὲν <υ—	405a
	—> φθίνει, φίλοι,	405b
	τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ †πέλας†,	
	μώραις δ' ἄγραις προσκείμεθα,	
	πᾶς δὴ στρατὸς δίπαλτος ἄν	
	με χειρὶ φονεύοι.	408/9
Τεκ.	ὦ δυστάλαινα, τοιάδ' ἄνδρα χρήσιμον	410
	φωνεῖν, ἃ πρόσθεν οὔτος οὐκ ἔτλη ποτ' ἄν.	
Αι.	ἰὼ	412a [ant. 3
	πόροι ἀλίρροθοι	412b
	πάραλά τ' ἄντρα καὶ νέμος ἐπάκτιον,	
	πολὺν πολὺν με δαρὸν τε δὴ	
	κατείχετ' ἀμφὶ Τροίαν χρόνον·	415/16
	ἀλλ' οὐκέτι μ', οὐκέτ' ἀμπνοᾶς	416/17
	ἔχοντα· τοῦτό τις φρονῶν ἴστω.	417/18
	ὦ Σκαμάνδριοι	419a
	γείτονες ῥοαὶ	419b
	εὐφρονες Ἀργείοις,	420
	οὐκέτ' ἄνδρα μὴ	
	τόνδ' ἴδητ' — ἔπος	
	ἔξερῶ μέγα —	
	οἶον οὔτινα	423/4
	Τρωῖα στρατοῦ	424
	δέρχθη χθονὸς μολόντ' ἀπὸ	425
	Ἑλλανίδος· τανῦν δ' ἄτι—	
	μος ὧδε πρόκειμαι.	426/7

403 φύγη] τράπη L^{γρ} **405a–405b** ante φθίνει lacunam pos. Hermann φίλοι] –οις Xr^s **407** μώραις QRN, Elmsley: μωραῖς ὦ **408** δὴ Stinton: δέ ὦ **412a** ἰὼ Brunck: ὦ K^{gl}: om. ὦ **416/17** μ] γ' Hermann **419a** ὦ Triclinius: ἰὼ ὦ **420** εὐφρονες ὦEu: εὐφρονες Heusinger: δύσφρονες Musgrave **421** μὴ LKaSu: με CFHOPPa **423** ἔξερῶ H^{ac} sine accentu, Porson: –έω ὦΛSu **423/4** οὔτινα] οὔτιν' ἅ Hermann **424** Τρωῖα Hermann: Τροία ὦ **425** δέρχθη] δέρχθη Hermann ἀπὸ Stinton: ἀπὸ ὦ **426/7** πρόκειμαι **a**: πρόκειται **l**

- Χο. οὔτοι σ' ἀπείργειν οὔθ' ὅπως ἔῶ λέγειν 428
ἔχω, κακοῖς τοιοῖσδε συμπεπτωκότα.
- Αι. αἰαῖ· τίς ἄν ποτ' ὦθ' ὦδ' ἐπώννυμον 430
τοῦμόν ξυνοίσειν ὄνομα τοῖς ἐμοῖς κακοῖς;
νῦν γὰρ πάρεστι καὶ δις αἰάζειν ἐμοί,
[καὶ τρίς· τοιούτοις γὰρ κακοῖς ἐντυγχάνω·]
ὅτου πατήρ μὲν τῆσδ' ἀπ' Ἰδαίας χθονὸς
τὰ πρῶτα καλλιστεῖ' ἀριστεύσας στρατοῦ 435
πρὸς οἶκον ἦλθε πᾶσαν εὐκλειαν φέρων·
ἐγὼ δ' ὁ κείνου παῖς, τὸν αὐτὸν εἰς τόπον
Τροίας ἐπελθὼν οὐκ ἐλάσسونι σθένει,
οὐδ' ἔργα μείω χειρὸς ἀρκέσας ἐμῆς,
ἄτιμος Ἀργείοισιν ὦδ' ἀπόλλυμαι. 440
καίτοι τοσοῦτόν γ' ἐξεπίστασθαι δοκῶ,
εἰ ζῶν Ἀχιλλεὺς τῶν ὅπλων τῶν ὦν πέρι
κρίνειν ἔμελλε κράτος ἀριστείας τινί,
οὐκ ἄν τις αὐτ' ἔμαρψεν ἄλλος ἄντ' ἐμοῦ.
νῦν δ' αὐτ' Ἀτρεΐδαι φωτὶ παντουργῶ φρένας 445
ἔπραξαν, ἀνδρὸς τοῦδ' ἀπώσαντες κράτη.
κεῖ μὴ τόδ' ὄμμα καὶ φρένες διάστροφοι
γνώμης ἀπῆξαν τῆς ἐμῆς, οὐκ ἄν ποτε
δίκην κατ' ἄλλου φωτὸς ὦδ' ἐπήφισαν.
νῦν δ' ἡ Διὸς γοργῶπις ἀδάματος θεὰ 450
ἦδη μ' ἐπ' αὐτοῖς χεῖρ' ἐπευθύνοντ' ἐμὴν
ἔσφηλεν ἐμβαλοῦσα λυσσώδη νόσον,
ὥστ' ἐν τοιοῖσδε χεῖρας αἰμάξαι βοτοῖς·
κεῖνοι δ' ἐπεγγελῶσιν ἐκπεφυγότες,

428 οὔθ] οὐδ' Elmsley [433] del. Morstadt: habent *ωSu* 441 γ' LKa: om. *Su*: δ' OV 443 κρίνειν] κρινεῖν Blaydes 445 αὐτ' LKa: ὦδ' D 446 ἔπραξαν *ωSu*: ἔδωκαν K^{gl}: ἔπρασαν Hartung 447 φρένες διάστροφοι] inverso ordine D^{gl}Xs^{gl} 448 ἀπῆξαν L^{ac}Ka: ἀπῆξαν L^{pc}A: ἀπείρξαν Xr, ed. Lond. 1722: μ' ἀπείρξαν Blaydes 449 ὦδ' *ωEu*: οἶδ' Reiske 450 ἀδάματος Λ², Elmsley: ἀδάμαστος *ωSu* 451 ἐπευθύνοντ' ΛC, Valckenaer: ἐπεντύνοντ' fort. D^{ac}: ἐπεντύνοντ' LKa 452 λυσσώδη νόσον] λυσσώδει νόσῳ *Su*

ἔμοῦ μὲν οὐχ ἐκόντος· εἰ δέ τις θεῶν 455
 βλάπτοι, φύγοι τᾶν χῶ κακὸς τὸν κρείσσονα.
 καὶ νῦν τί χρή δρᾶν; ὅστις ἐμφανῶς θεοῖς
 ἐχθαίρομαι, μισεῖ δέ μ' Ἑλλήνων στρατός,
 ἔχθει δὲ Τροία πᾶσα καὶ πεδία τάδε.
 πότερα πρὸς οἴκους, ναυλόχους λιπὼν ἔδρας 460
 μόνους τ' Ἀτρείδας, πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον περῶ;
 καὶ ποῖον ὄμμα πατρὶ δηλώσω φανεῖς
 Τελαμῶνι; πῶς με τλήσεται ποτ' εἰσιδεῖν
 γυμνὸν φανέντα τῶν ἀριστείων ἄτερ,
 ὦν αὐτὸς ἔσχε στέφανον εὐκλείας μέγαν; 465
 οὐκ ἔστι τοῦργον τλητόν. ἀλλὰ δῆτ' ἰὼν
 πρὸς ἔρυμα Τρώων, ξυμπεσὼν μόνος μόνους
 καὶ δρῶν τι χρηστόν, εἴτα λοίσθιον θάνω;
 ἀλλ' ὧδέ γ' Ἀτρείδας ἂν εὐφράναιμί που.
 οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα. πεῖρά τις ζητητέα 470
 τοιάδ' ἀφ' ἧς γέροντι δηλώσω πατρὶ
 μή τοι φύσιν γ' ἄσπλαγχνος ἐκ κείνου γεγώς.
 αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ἄνδρα τοῦ μακροῦ χρήζειν βίου,
 κακοῖσιν ὅστις μηδὲν ἐξαλλάσσεται.
 τί γὰρ παρ' ἡμαρ ἡμέρα τέρπειν ἔχει 475
 ἥ προσθεῖσα κἀναθεῖσα τοῦ γε κατθανεῖν;
 οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην οὐδενὸς λόγου βροτὸν
 ὅστις κενᾶσιν ἐλπίσιν θερμαίνεται.
 ἀλλ' ἢ καλῶς ζῆν ἢ καλῶς τεθνηκέναι
 τὸν εὐγενῆ χρή. πάντ' ἀκήκοας λόγον. 480
 Χο. οὐδεὶς ἐρεῖ ποθ' ὡς ὑπόβλητον λόγον,
 Αἴας, ἔλεξας, ἀλλὰ τῆς σαυτοῦ φρενός.

455 οὐχ ἐκόντος *ωΛSu*: οὐκ ἔχοντος *L^{79p}*: οὐ κιχόντος Naber **456** τᾶν
Q^cCZc, Mosq. gr. 504: γ' ἂν *ωΛ* **457** post δρᾶν add. μ' N, Morstadt
467 μόνος μόνοις] μόνος μόνω *C^{ac}*, Mekler **469** εὐφράναιμι *ΛKAZr*
 –αίνομαι L: –άνοιμι *DXs* [*Xr*] **470** ἔστι ταῦτα] ἔστιν· ἀλλὰ Reiske
473 ἄνδρα] ἔστι *Su* **476** κἀναθεῖσα *ωStSu*: κἀνεθεῖσα *A^{is}*: κἀνιῖσα Pear-
 son τοῦ γε *L^{pc}KaStSu*: τοῦ δὲ *L^{ac}St* **477** πριαίμην *ωStSuEu*: ποιοίμην
 Nauck βροτὸν *ωStSu(Eu)*: –ὦν *St* **478** κενᾶσιν *ωSu*: καλαῖσιν *St*
481 ὑπόβλητον *LKADXs^{pc}Su*: ἀπο– *XrXs^{ac}Zr* **482** Αἴας] Αἴαν *Su*
 σαυτοῦ *aSu*: αὐτοῦ *LK*

παῦσαι γε μέντοι καὶ δὸς ἀνδράσιν φίλοις
γνώμης κρατῆσαι τάσδε φροντίδας μεθείς.
Τεκ. ὦ δέσποτ' Αἴας, τῆς ἀναγκαίας τύχης
οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν μείζον ἀνθρώποις κακόν.
ἐγὼ δ' ἔλευθέρου μὲν ἐξέφυν πατρός,
εἶπερ τινὸς σθένοντος ἐν πλούτῳ Φρυγῶν·
νῦν δ' εἰμὶ δούλη. θεοῖς γὰρ ὦδ' ἔδοξέ που
καὶ σῇ μάλιστα χειρί. τοιγαροῦν, ἐπεὶ
τὸ σὸν λέχος ξυνῆλθον, εὖ φρονῶ τὰ σά,
καὶ σ' ἀντιάζω πρὸς τ' ἔφεστίου Διὸς
εὐνῆς τε τῆς σῆς, ἥ συνηλλάχχης ἐμοί,
μή μ' ἀξιώσης βάσιν ἀλγεινὴν λαβεῖν
τῶν σὼν ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν, χειρίαν ἐφείς τιιν.
ἥ γὰρ θάνης σὺ καὶ τελευτήσας ἀφῆς,
ταύτη νόμιζε κάμ' ἐτὶ τότ' ἡμέρα
βία ξυναρπασθεῖσαν Ἀργείων ὑπο
ξύν παιδί τῷ σῷ δουλίαν ἔξειν τροφήν.
καὶ τις πικρὸν πρόσφθεγγμα δεσποτῶν ἔρει
λόγοις ἰάπτων, “ἴδετε τὴν ὀμευνέτιν
Αἴαντος, ὃς μέγιστον ἴσχυσε στρατοῦ,
οἷας λατρείας ἀνθ' ὅσου ζήλου τρέφει.”
τοιαῦτ' ἔρει τις· κάμ' ἐν δαίμων ἔλξ,
σοὶ δ' αἰσχροὶ τὰ πη ταῦτα καὶ τῷ σῷ γένει.
ἀλλ' αἰδεσθαι μὲν πατέρα τὸν σὸν ἐν λυγρῷ
γῆρα προλείπων, αἰδεσθαι δὲ μητέρα
πολλῶν ἐτῶν κληροῦχον, ἥ σε πολλακίς
θεοῖς ἀρᾶται ζῶντα πρὸς δόμους μολεῖν·
οἴκτιρε δ', ὦναξ, παῖδα τὸν σόν, εἰ νέας
τροφῆς στερηθεὶς σοῦ διοίσεται μόνος

485 Αἶας] Αἴαν *Su* **495** ἐφείς LK: ἀφ- **a** **496** ἦ Bothe: εἰ **1**: ἦν **a**
 θάνης] -οις JJb τελευτήσας LP^a: -ήσεις **1** ἀφῆς LK^a: ἀφείς GCF¹⁵ HV,
 fort. P^{ac}: ἀφ' ἧς D: ἐφῆς *Su*: μ' ἀφῆς Battier **499** δουλῖαν **a**: -ίαν γ'
 Zr: -ιον LK **500** πρόσφθεγγα scripsi post West: -εγμα ὦ **501**
 ἰάπτων ὠΛ*SuEu*: ἀτίχων L^{γρ} **502** ἰσχυσε ὠ*Su*: -υε Blaydes **503**
 οἶας λατρείας ὠ*Su*: -αν -αν FV, Blaydes **507** προλείπων] -ειν Wolff
510 οἴκτιρε Nauck: οἴκτειρε ὠ

- ὑπ' ὀρφανιστῶν μὴ φίλων, ὅσον κακὸν
 κείνω τε κάμοι τοῦθ', ὅταν θάνῃς, νεμεῖς.
 ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκέτ' ἔστιν εἰς ὃ τι βλέπω
 πλὴν σοῦ. σὺ γάρ μοι πατρίδ' ἦστωσας δορί, 515
 καὶ μητέρ' ἄλλῃ μοῖρα τὸν φύσαντά τε
 καθεῖλεν Ἀίδου θανασίμους οἰκήτορας.
 τίς δῆτ' ἐμοὶ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀντὶ σοῦ πατρίς;
 τίς πλοῦτος; ἐν σοὶ πᾶς ἔγωγε σῶζομαι.
 ἀλλ' ἴσχε κάμοῦ μνηστίν· ἀνδρὶ τοι χρεῶν 520
 μνήμην προσεῖναι, τερπνὸν εἴ τί που πάθοι.
 χάρις χάριν γὰρ ἔστιν ἢ τίκτους' αἰεῖ·
 ὅτου δ' ἀπορρεῖ μνηστὶς εὖ πεπονθότος,
 οὐκ ἂν γένοιτ' ἔθ' οὗτος εὐγενὴς ἀνὴρ.
 Χο. Αἴας, ἔχειν σ' ἂν οἶκτον ὥς κἀγὼ φρενὶ 525
 θέλοίμ' ἂν· αἰνοίης γὰρ ἂν τὰ τῆσδ' ἔπη.
 Αἱ. καὶ κάρτ' ἐπαίνου τεύξεται πρὸς γοῦν ἐμοῦ,
 ἐὰν μόνον τὸ ταχθὲν εὖ τολμᾷ τελεῖν.
 Τεκ. ἀλλ', ὦ φίλ' Αἴας, πάντ' ἔγωγε πείσομαι.
 Αἱ. κόμιζε νῦν μοι παῖδα τὸν ἐμόν, ὥς ἴδω. 530
 Τεκ. καὶ μὴν φόβοισί γ' αὐτὸν ἐξελυσάμην.
 Αἱ. ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς κακοῖσιν, ἧ τί μοι λέγεις;
 Τεκ. μὴ σοὶ γέ που δύστηνος ἀντήσας θάνοι.
 Αἱ. πρέπον γέ τ' ἂν ἦν δαίμονος τοῦμοῦ τόδε.
 Τεκ. ἀλλ' οὖν ἐγὼ φύλαξα τοῦτό γ' ἀρκέσαι. 535
 Αἱ. ἐπήνεσ' ἔργον καὶ πρόνοιαν ἦν ἔθου.
 Τεκ. τί δῆτ' ἂν ὥς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἂν ὠφελοῖμί σε;
 Αἱ. δός μοι προσειπεῖν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῇ τ' ἰδεῖν.
 Τεκ. καὶ μὴν πέλας γε προσπόλοις φυλάσσεται.

515 δορί] δόρει Dindorf **516** ἄλλῃ D, Porson: ἀλλ' ἢ LK^a: αἰνή Herwerden τε {L}K, Bothe: με **a** **519** πᾶς K^a: πᾶσιν LΛK^{rs}Zr **521** πάθοι] -ῃ L **522** τίκτους] φύουσ' L^{rs} **524** γένοιτ' ὡς *Si*: λέγοιτ' Tournier *ἐθ'* LK^s: om. D*Si*: ποθ' **a**: ἂν *Si* (cum οὕτως pro οὐκ ἂν) **531** φόβοισί γ'] φόβοισιν D: φόβῳ σοῦ γ' Reiske: φόβῳ σῶ γ' Blaydes ἐξελυσάμην ὡς *Si*: ἐξεργασάμην Hermann (cf. Σ; -p- iam Pierson) **534** post ἦν interp. Jackson τοῦμοῦ] τ' ἐμοῦ Blaydes **535** φύλαξα Xr, Bentley: φύλαξα LK^a **537** δῆτ' ἂν ὥς] δῆτα δρῶς Van Eldik

Αι.	τί δῆτα μέλλει μὴ οὐ παρουσίαν ἔχειν;	540
Τεκ.	ὦ παῖ, πατήρ καλεῖ σε. δεῦρο προσπόλων ἄγ' αὐτόν ὅσπερ χερσὶν εὐθύνων κυρεῖς.	
Αι.	ἔρποντι φωνεῖς, ἢ ληλειμμένω λόγου;	
Τεκ.	καὶ δὴ κομίζει προσπόλων ὅδ' ἐγγύθεν.	
Αι.	αἶρ' αὐτόν, αἶρε δεῦρο· ταρβήσει γὰρ οὗ, νεοσφαγῇ †τουτονδε† προσλεύσσω φόνον, εἵπερ δικαίως ἔστ' ἐμὸς τὰ πατρόθεν. ἀλλ' αὐτίκ' ὦμοῖς αὐτόν ἐν νόμοις πατρός δεῖ πωλοδαμνεῖν κάξομοιοῦσθαι φύσιν. ὦ παῖ, γένοιο πατρός εὐτυχέστερος, τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ὅμοιος· καὶ γένοι' ἂν οὐ κακός. καίτοι σε καὶ νῦν τοῦτό γε ζηλοῦν ἔχω, ὀθούνεκ' οὐδὲν τῶνδ' ἐπαισθάνη κακῶν. ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἡδιστος βίος, [τὸ μὴ φρονεῖν γὰρ κάρτ' ἀνώδυνον κακόν,] ἕως τὸ χαίρειν καὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μάθης. ὅταν δ' ἴκη πρὸς τοῦτο, δεῖ σ' ὅπως πατρός δείξεις ἐν ἐχθροῖς οἶος ἐξ οἴου ἔτράφη. τέως δὲ κούφοις πνεύμασιν βόσκου νέαν ψυχὴν ἀτάλλων, μητρὶ τῇδε χαρμονήν. οὔτοι σ' Ἀχαιῶν, οἶδα, μὴ τις ὑβρίση στυγναῖσι λώβαις, οὐδὲ χωρὶς ὄντ' ἐμοῦ. τοῖον πυλωρὸν φύλακα Τεῦκρον ἀμφὶ σοὶ λείψω τροφῆς ἄοκνον ἔμπα κεῖ τανῦν τηλωπὸς οἶχνεῖ, δυσμενῶν θήραν ἔχων. ἀλλ', ἄνδρες ἀσπιστῆρες, ἐνάλιος λεώς, ὕμιν τε κοινὴν τήνδ' ἐπισκῆπτω χάριν,	545 550 554 554b 555 560 565

543 λόγου K^{ac} a: -ων LK^{pc}Λ 544 ὅδ' ὦδ' LK^{pc}Λ 546 del. Dindorf
τουτονδε] τοῦ τόνδε L: τ[] Λ: τοῦτον δὲ K¹: ποῦ τόνδε Zc: που τόνδε
A: τοῦτόν γε K²XrXsZr: τοιόνδε Mekler [554b] om. S₁ del. Wessel-
ing: praebent ὠΛΣSu 557 δείξεις a: -ης l ἔτράφη NP, Heath: τράφη
ω 562 ἀμφὶ σοὶ Diggle: ἀμφὶ σοὶ ω 563 τροφῆς ὠΛ: -ῇ τ' Nauck
564 θήραν ὠΛSu: φρουράν L¹γρK^{γρ} 565 ἐνάλιος a: εἰνά- IDSu 566
κοινὴν ὠSu: -ῇ Zr

- κείνῳ τ' ἔμην ἀγγείλατ' ἐντολήν, ὅπως
 τὸν παῖδα τόνδε πρὸς δόμους ἐμούς ἄγων
 Τελαμῶνι δείξει μητρί τ', Ἐριβοίᾳ λέγω,
 ὥς σφιν γένηται γηροβοσκὸς εἰσαεῖ 570
 [μέχρις οὗ μυχοὺς κίχῳσι τοῦ κάτω θεοῦ].
 καὶ τὰμὰ τεύχη μήτ' ἀγωνάρχαι τινὲς
 θήσουσ' Ἀχαιοῖς μήθ' ὁ <—x—υ—
 x—υ—x—υ> λυμεῶν ἐμός.
 ἀλλ' αὐτό μοι σύ, παῖ, λαβὼν τοῦπώνυμον,
 Εὐρύσακες, ἴσχε διὰ πολυρράφου στρέφων 575
 πόρπακος ἐπτάβοιον ἄρρηκτον σάκος·
 τὰ δ' ἄλλα τεύχη κοίν' ἐμοὶ τεθάπεται.
 ἀλλ' ὥς τάχος τὸν παῖδα τόνδ' ἤδη δέχου,
 καὶ δῶμα πάκτου, μηδ' ἐπισκῆνους γόους
 δάκρυε. κάρτα τοι φιλοίκτιστον γυνή. 580
 πύκαζε θᾶσσον. οὐ πρὸς ἱατροῦ σοφοῦ
 θρηνεῖν ἐπωδὰς πρὸς τομῶντι πῆματι.
 Χο. δέδοικ' ἀκούων τήνδε τὴν προθυμίαν.
 οὐ γάρ μ' ἀρέσκει γλῶσσά σου τεθηγμένη.
 Τεκ. ὦ δέσποτ' Αἴας, τί ποτε δρασεῖς φρενί;
 Αἱ. μὴ κρίνε, μὴ ξέταζε· σωφρονεῖν καλόν. 585
 Τεκ. οἴμ' ὥς ἄθυμῶ· πρὸς σε καὶ τοῦ σοῦ τέκνου
 καὶ θεῶν ἰκνοῦμαι, μὴ προδοὺς ἡμᾶς γένη.
 Αἱ. ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς. οὐ κάτοισθ' ἐγὼ θεοῖς
 ὥς οὐδὲν ἄρκεῖν εἴμ' ὀφειλέτης ἔτι; 590
 Τεκ. εὖφημα φώνει. Αἱ. τοῖς ἀκούουσιν λέγε.
 Τεκ. σὺ δ' οὐχὶ πείση; Αἱ. πόλλ' ἄγαν ἤδη θροεῖς.
 Τεκ. ταρβῶ γάρ, ὦναξ. Αἱ. οὐ ξυνεῖρξεθ' ὥς τάχος;

569 δείξει a: —η 1 Ἐριβοίᾳ] —αν Valckenaer [571] del. Elmsley: habent
 ωSu 573 μήθ' ὁ ωSu: μήτε Schaefer ante λυμεῶν lacunam pos. Jackson
 574 τοῦπώνυμον Fraenkel: ἐπώνυμον ωSu 579 δῶμα πάκτου Eu, fort.
 C^{ac}, Turnebus: δῶμ' ἀπάκτου ωΛSu 582 θρηνεῖν LKAD^{γρ} SuEu: θροεῖν
 A^{γρ}DXrXsZrSu πῆματι ωSuEu: τραύματι L^{γρ}K^{γρ}Xs^cΣ^DSu 587 πρὸς
 σε καὶ Tournier: καὶ σε πρὸς ωSu 589 γε] με Monac. gr. 507, H^{pc2},
 Jaeger (ἔμε P^{gl}) 590 ἄρκεῖν ωSu: εἴκειν Zomarides 593 ξυνεῖρξεθ'
 Blaydes: ξυνέρξεθ' ω

Τεκ.	πρὸς θεῶν, μαλάσσου. Αἰ. μῶρά μοι δοκεῖς φρονεῖν, εἰ τοῦμόν ῥηθὸς ἄρτι παιδεύειν νοεῖς.	595
Χο.	ὦ κλεινὰ Σαλαμῖς, σὺ μέν που ναίεις ἀλίπληκτος εὐδαίμων, πᾶσιν περίφαντος αἰεὶ· ἐγὼ δ' ὁ τλάμων παλαιὸς ἀφ' οὗ χρόνος Ἰδαῖα μίμνων λειμώνια †ποιά† μη– νῶν ἀνήριθμος αἰὲν εὐνῶμαι χρόνῳ τρυχόμενος, κακὰν ἐλπίδ' ἔχων ἔτι μέ ποθ' ἀνύσειν τὸν ἀπότηροπον αἰδῆλον Ἄιδαν.	[str. 1 596/7 598 599/600 601/3 603/4 605 607/8
	καί μοι δυσθεράπευτος Αἴ– ας ξύνεστιν ἔφεδρος, ὥμοι μοι, θεία μανίᾳ ξύναιλος· ὄν ἐξεπέμψω πρὶν δὴ ποτε θουρίῳ κρατοῦντ' ἐν Ἄρει· νῦν δ' αὖ φρενὸς οἰοβώ– τας φίλοις μέγα πένθος ἡὔρηται. τὰ πρὶν δ' ἔργα χεροῖν μεγίστας ἀρετᾶς ἄφιλα παρ' ἀφίλοις ἔπεισ' ἔπεισε μελέοις Ἀτρείδαις. ἥ που παλαιᾷ μὲν ἔντροφος ἀμέρᾳ	609 [ant. 1 609/10 611 612/13 614/16 616/17 618 620/1 622/3 [str. 2

594 δοκεῖς φρονεῖν *ωSu* (nisi quod δοκεῖς λέγειν *L^{TP}*): inverso ordine *Λ* **596/7** ἀλίπληκτος Dawe: –ακτος *DXsZr*: –αγκτος *IAXrEu* **598** πᾶσιν. . . αἰεὶ Triclinius: πᾶσι. . . αἰεὶ *ωΛ* **601/3** Ἰδαῖα Hermann: Ἰδαίᾳ *ωΛ*: Ἰδαῖδι Bergk μίμνων *ΛΛ*: –ω *ω* λειμώνια Hermann: λειμωνίᾳ *ωΛ* ποίᾳ *ΛΛα*: πόα *KD*: ἔπαυλα Lobeck μηνῶν Hermann: μήλων *ωΛ* **603/4** εὐνῶμαι Bergk: εὐνόμα Triclinius: εὐνόμα *ω* **605** χρόνῳ] πόνῳ Martin **607/8** ἔτι] ὅτι *L^s* ποθ' ἀνύσειν Willink post West: ποτ' ἀνύσειν *ω* **609/10** ὥμοι μοι scripsi: ὥμοι μοι Triclinius: ἰώ μοι μοι μοι *IAXs*: ἰώ μοι μοι *a* **614/16** νῦν δ'] νῦν *Su* οἰοβώτας *LSu*: οἰωβότας Triclinius, Zb: οἰοβότας *ω* **616/17** ἡὔρηται Dindorf: εὔ– *ωSu*: γεγένηται *γ^{PL}L^rK^r* **618** χεροῖν Triclinius: χερσὶν *La*: χερσὶ *KDSu* **619** μεγίστας Triclinius: μέγιστ' *ωSSu* **620/1** παρ' ἀφίλοις *KAXrXsZrSu*: παρὰ φίλοις *LD* **622/3** ἔντροφος *ωSu*: σύν– *Zc^{rgl}*, Nauck

λευκά τε γήρ᾽ μάτηρ νιν ὅταν νοσοῦν— 624/5
 τα φρενοβόρως ἀκούσῃ, 625/6
 αἴλινον αἴλινον 627
 οὐδ' οἰκτρᾶς γόον ὄρνιθος ἀηδοῦς
 ἦσει δύσμορος, ἀλλ' ὀδυτόνους μὲν ὠδὰς 629/30
 θρηνήσῃ, χερόπληκτοι δ' 631
 ἐν στέρνοισι πεσοῦνται
 δοῦποι καὶ πολιᾶς ἄμυγμα χαίτας.

κρείσσων παρ' Αἰδᾶ κέϋων ὁ νοσῶν μάταν, 634/5 [ant. 2
 ὅς εἷς πατρῴας ἦκων γενεᾶς ἄρισ— 636/7
 τος πολυπόνων Ἀχαιῶν, 637/8
 οὐκέτι συντρόφοις 639
 ὀργαῖς ἔμπεδος, ἀλλ' ἐκτὸς ὁμιλεῖ. 640
 ὦ τλαῖμον πάτερ, οἶαν σε μένει πυθέσθαι 641/2
 παιδὸς δύσφορον ἄταν, 643
 ἄν οὔπω τις ἔθρεψεν
 αἰὼν Αἰακιδᾶν ἄτερθε τοῦδε. 645

Αἰ. ἅπανθ' ὁ μακρὸς κἀναριθμητὸς χρόνος
 φύει τ' ἄδηλα καὶ φανέντα κρύπτεται·
 κοῦκ ἔστ' ἀελπτον οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ὀλίσκεται
 χῶ δεινὸς ὄρκος χαὶ περισκελεῖς φρένες.
 κἀγὼ γάρ, ὅς τὰ δειν' ἐκαρτέρουν τότε 650
 βαφῇ σίδηρος ὥς, ἐθελύνθην στόμα
 πρὸς τῆσδε τῆς γυναικός· οἰκτίρω δέ νιν

624/5 λευκά Schneidewin: -ῶ *ωSu* τε *ZuSu*: δὲ *ω* **625/6** φρενοβόρως
 Dindorf: -μόρως *L^{ac2}KZr*: -μώρως *L^(pc2)a*: φρέν' ἀμόρως Meineke
629/30 ἦσει *LK^{γρ}a*: ἦσει *G^cCNO*: ἄσει *KX^sm*: ἄσει *Su*: σχήσει Reiske
631 χερόπληκτοι *ωSu*: -ακτοι Lobeck **632** στέρνοισι *D^{pc}*: -οις *ωSu*
633 ἄμυγμα Bothe: -ατα *ωEu* **634/5** κρείσσων *L^xKZr*: κρέσσων *L^xa*
 παρ' Elmsley: γὰρ *ω* ὁ Lobeck: ἦ *ω* **636/7** εἷς Lloyd-Jones: ἐκ *ω*
 ἄριστος *Zu*, cod. antiquissimus teste Triclinio: ἄριστα *Σ^L*, Livineii 'V':
 om. *ω*, sedλείπει τὸ ἄριστος *glLK* **641/2** τλαῖμον *KDXr*: τλάμων *La*
645 αἰὼν] δίων Bergk **647** φύει *ωΛSu*: ποιεῖ *St*: φαίνει Herwerden
648 κοῦκ *ωΛSu*: οὐκ *Xs^{ac}StSu* **649** χαὶ Markland (αἰ ἄγαν σκληραὶ
K^{gl}D^{gl}X^rgl): καὶ *ωΛStSu* **650** ἐκαρτέρουν τότε *ωΛSu*: ἐπηπείλησ' ἐπη
L^{γρ} **652** οἰκτίρω Nauck: οἰκτεῖρω *ω*

χήραν παρ' ἐχθροῖς παῖδά τ' ὀρφανὸν λιπεῖν.
 ἀλλ' εἶμι πρὸς τε λουτρὰ καὶ παρακτίους
 λειμῶνας, ὥς ἂν λύμαθ' ἀγνίσας ἐμὰ 655
 μῆνιν βαρεῖαν ἐξαλέξωμαι θεᾶς·
 μολὼν τε χῶρον ἔνθ' ἂν ἀστιβῆ κίχῳ
 κρύψω τόδ' ἔγχος τοῦμόν, ἔχιστον βελῶν,
 γαίης ὀρύξας ἔνθα μή τις ὄψεται·
 ἀλλ' αὐτὸ Νύξ Ἀιδης τε σωζόντων κάτω. 660
 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐξ οὗ χειρὶ τοῦτ' ἐδεξάμην
 παρ' Ἑκτορος δῶρημα δυσμενεστάτου,
 οὔπω τι κεδνὸν ἔσχον Ἀργείων πάρα.
 ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἀληθὴς ἡ βροτῶν παροιμία,
 ἐχθρῶν ἄδωρα δῶρα κοῦκ ὄνησιμα. 665
 τοιγὰρ τὸ λοιπὸν εἰσόμεσθα μὲν θεοῖς
 εἶκιν, μαθησόμεσθα δ' Ἀτρείδας σέβειν.
 ἄρχοντές εἰσιν, ὥσθ' ὑπεικτέον. τί μῆν;
 καὶ γὰρ τὰ δεινὰ καὶ τὰ καρτερώτατα
 τιμαῖς ὑπείκει· τοῦτο μὲν νιφοστιβεῖς 670
 χειμῶνες ἐκχωροῦσιν εὐκάρπῳ θέρει·
 ἐξίσταται δὲ νυκτὸς αἰανὴς κύκλος
 τῇ λευκοπώλῳ φέγγος ἡμέρᾳ φλέγειν·
 δεινῶν δ' ἄημα πνευμάτων ἐκοίμισε
 στένοντα πόντον· ἐν δ' ὁ παγκρατὴς Ὕπνος 675
 λύει πεδῆσας, οὐδ' αἶ λαβὼν ἔχει.
 ἡμεῖς δὲ πῶς οὐ γνωσόμεσθα σωφρονεῖν;
 ἔγωγ' ἐπίσταμαι γὰρ ἀρτίως ὅτι
 ὃ τ' ἐχθρὸς ἡμῖν ἐς τοσόνδ' ἐχθαρτέος,
 ὥς καὶ φιλήσων αὐθις, ἔς τε τὸν φίλον 680

653 λιπεῖν] —ων Blaydes **656** ἐξαλέξωμαι West: ἐξαλέξομαι O^{ac} Δ:
 ἐξαλύξωμαι He: ἐξαλεύσωμαι ωSu **667** Ἀτρείδας ωStSuEu: Ἀτρεῖδα L
668 τί μῆν; Linwood: τί μή; vel τιμῇ; ωStSu **669** δεινὰ ωStSu: θεῖα
 Wilamowitz e Σ **672** αἰανὴς LSuFa: —ῆς ωStSu **674** δεινῶν KaSt:
 —ον LAsuSu δ' Erfurd: τ' ωStSu **676** λαβὼν] λαχὼν Su **678** ἔγωγ'
 Heath, post quod interp. Seager: ἐγὼ δ' ωSu: ἐγὼδ' Porson **679** ἡμῖν
 K.Su: ἡμην ωK^{γρ}Su ἐχθαρτέος LK{Su}: ἐχθραντέος aSu

τοσαῦθ' ὑπουργῶν ὠφελεῖν βουλήσομαι,
ὥς αἰὲν οὐ μενοῦντα. τοῖς πολλοῖσι γὰρ
βροτῶν ἄπιστός ἐσθ' ἑταιρείας λιμήν.
ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ μὲν τούτοισιν εὖ σχήσει· σὺ δὲ
ἔσω θεοῖς ἔλθοῦσα διὰ τέλους, γύναι, 685
εὖχου τελεῖσθαι τοῦμὸν ὦν ἔρξ' κέαρ.
ὕμεις θ', ἑταῖροι, ταῦτ' ἀτὰρ τῇδ' ἐμοὶ τάδε
τιμᾶτε, Τεύκρω τ', ἣν μόλη, σημήνατε
μέλειν μὲν ἡμῶν, εὐνοεῖν δ' ὑμῖν ἅμα·
ἐγὼ γὰρ εἴμ' ἐκείσ' ὅποι πορευτέον, 690
ὕμεις δ' ἂν φράζω δρᾶτε, καὶ τάχ' ἂν μ' ἴσως
πύθοισθε, κεῖ νῦν δυστυχῶ, σεσωμένον.

Χο. ἔφριξ' ἔρωτι, περιχαρὴς δ' ἀνεπτάμαν. [str.
ἰὼ ἰὼ Πάν Πάν,
ὦ Πάν Πάν ἀλίπλαγκτε Κυλ– 695
λανίας χιονοκτύπου
πετραίας ἀπὸ δειράδος
φάνθη, ὦ θεῶν χοροποι' ἄναξ,
ὅπως μοι Μῦσια Κνώϊ ὄρ–
χήματ' αὐτοδαῆ ξυνὼν ἰάψης. 699/700
νῦν γὰρ ἐμοὶ μέλει χορεῦσαι. 701
Ἰκαρίων δ' ὑπὲρ πελαγέων
μολῶν ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων
ὁ Δάλιος εὐγνωστος

681 τοσαῦθ' ὠ*Su*: τοιαῦθ' *Su* **683** ἑταιρείας *LKaSu*: –ίας *XrZr* **685**
ἔσω *LK*: εἴσω **a** τέλους ὠ*Λ*: τάχους *L²⁸G⁸F⁸H^{7p}N⁸P⁸* **687** θ] δ' *F*,
fort. *C^{ac}*, Blaydes **689** εὐνοεῖν] εὖ νοεῖν *C* ὑμῖν ἅμα **a**: ὑμῶν ἅμα
I: (ὑμῶν) μετὰ *K^{rsyp}*, Schneidewin: ὑπερμέγα *L^{ryp}K^{rmyp}*: ἡμῖν ἅμα (cum
ὑμῶν pro ἡμῶν) West **692** σεσωμένον Wecklein: σεσωσ– ὦ **693**
ἔφριξ' ὠ*Eu*: ἔφριξ' ἐν *lmΣ^L* ἀνεπτάμαν *L^{ac}AXr*: –ἀμην *DXsZr*: –όμαν *L^{pc}K*:
–όμην *SuEu* **694** ἰὼ bis *Π³LKADXR*: semel *XsZr*: ter *O* **695** Πάν bis
Π³ω: semel *XsZr* ἀλίπλαγκτε *LKAXs*: –ακτε **a** **696** χιονοκτύπου *Zr*:
–οτύπου *ADXR^{lpc}Xs*: –οτύπου *LK*: –οκτύπου *H^{is}* **698** χοροποι' *Tri-*
clinius: χοροποιῇ *LKa*: χο[*Π³* **699** Μῦσια *Π³Su*: Νύσ(σ)ια ὠ*Eu* Κνώσ'
FJZb: –σια *LKD*: –σσί *AXr*: –σσια *XsZrEu* **699/700** ἰάψης ὠ*Su*: –εις *L*
702 πελαγέων] –ίων *NVZc*: κελεύθων *Lloyd-Jones et Wilson*

ἐμοὶ ξυνείη διὰ παντὸς εὖφρων.	705
ἔλυσεν αἶνὸν ἄχος ἀπ' ὀμμάτων Ἄρης.	[ant.
ἰὼ ἰὼ, νῦν αὔ,	
νῦν, ὦ Ζεῦ, πάρα λευκὸν εὖ—	
ἀμερον πελάσαι φάος	
θοᾶν ὠκυάλων νεῶν,	710
ὄτ' Αἴας λαθίπωνος πάλιν,	
θεῶν δ' αὖ πάνθ' ὅσα θέσμι' ἐξ—	
ήνυσ' εὐνομίᾳ σέβων μεγίστα.	712/13
πάνθ' ὁ μέγας χρόνος μαραίνει·	714
κοῦδ' ἐν ἀναύδητον φατίσαιμ'	715
ἄν, εὔτε γ' ἐξ ἀέλπτων	
Αἴας μετανεγνώσθη	
θυμοῦ τ' Ἀτρείδαις μεγάλων τε νεικέων.	

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

ἄνδρες φίλοι, τὸ πρῶτον ἀγγεῖλαι θέλω,	
Τεῦκρος πάρεστιν ἄρτι Μυσίων ἀπὸ	720
κρημνῶν· μέσον δὲ προσμολῶν στρατήγιον	
κυδάζεται τοῖς πᾶσιν Ἀργείοις ὁμοῦ.	
στείχοντα γὰρ πρόσωθεν αὐτὸν ἐν κύκλῳ	
μαθόντες ἀμφέστησαν, εἴτ' ὀνειδέσιν	
ἥρασσον ἔνθεν κᾶνθεν, οὔτις ἔσθ' ὅς οὔ,	725
τὸν τοῦ μανέντος κάπιβουλευτοῦ στρατῶ	
ξύναιμον ἀποκαλοῦντες, ὥς τ' οὐκ ἀρκέσοι	

705 ξυνείη **1**: ξυνείης **a** **706** ἔλυσεν *L^{ac}K^{ac}*, Heath: ἔλυσεν γὰρ *L^{pc}K^{pc}AA*: ἔλυσε γὰρ **a**: ἔλυσε δ' Elmsley **712** ἐξήνυσ' *Livineii* 'pV': ἐξήνυσεν ὦ **714** μαραίνει *Sl*, *Livineius*: μαραίνει τε καὶ φλέγει *ωSu* **715** ἀναύδητον *ωSu*: —ακτον *Hesychius*: —ατον *Valckenaer* φατίσαιμ' *Livineii* 'p': φατίξαιμ' *LKaSu* **717** μετανεγνώσθη *LKSu*: μετεγνώσθη **a** **718** θυμοῦ *Hermann*: θυμῶν *G^{yp}N^{is}Fⁿ*: θυμὸν *ωSu* τ' *A*: om. *LKaSu* **719** τὸ πρῶτον] πρῶτον τόδ' *Blaydes* **722** κυδάζεται *ωSu*: σκ—Σ ad Homerum **725** οὔτις *LKA^{pc}XrXsSu*: κοῦτις *Zr*, fort. *A^{ac}* **726** στρατῶ *Schaefer*: —οῦ *ωSu* **727** ξύναιμον *LK* et *Suidas*: συν— **a** τ' *K*, *Musgrave*: om. *ωSu* ἀρκέσοι *ωSu*: —έσει *FHV*

- τὸ μὴ οὐ πέτροισι πᾶς καταξανθεὶς θανεῖν.
ὥστ' εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον ὥστε καὶ χεροῖν
κολεῶν ἐρυστὰ διεπεραιώθη ξίφη. 730
λήγει δ' ἔρις δραμοῦσα τοῦ προσωτάτω
ἀνδρῶν γερόντων ἐν ξυναλλαγῇ λόγου.
ἀλλ' ἡμιν Αἴας ποῦ ἔστιν, ὡς φράσω τάδε;
τοῖς κυρίοις γὰρ πάντα χρή δηλοῦν λόγον.
- Χο. οὐκ ἔνδον, ἀλλὰ φροῦδος ἀρτίως, νέας 735
βουλὰς νέοισιν ἐγκαταζεύξας τρόποις.
- Αγγ. ἰοῦ ἰοῦ.
βραδεῖαν ἡμᾶς ἄρ' ὁ τήνδε τὴν ὁδὸν
πέμπων ἔπεμψεν, ἥ φάνην ἐγὼ βραδύς.
- Χο. τί δ' ἐστὶ χρεῖας τῆσδ' ὑπεσπανισμένον; 740
Αγγ. τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀπηύδα Τεῦκρος ἔνδοθεν στέγης
μὴ ῥω παρεῖναι, πρὶν παρὼν αὐτὸς τύχη.
- Χο. ἀλλ' οἴχεται τοι, πρὸς τὸ κέρδιον τραπεῖς
γνώμης, θεοῖσιν ὡς καταλλαχθῇ χόλου.
- Αγγ. ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τᾶπη μωρίας πολλῆς πλέα, 745
εἴπερ τι Κάλχας εὖ φρονῶν μαντεύεται.
- Χο. ποῖον; τί δ' εἰδὼς τοῦδε πράγματος πέρι;
- Αγγ. τοσοῦτον οἶδα καὶ παρὼν ἐτύγχανον.
ἐκ γὰρ συνέδρου καὶ τυραννικοῦ κύκλου
Κάλχας μεταστὰς οἷος Ἀτρειδῶν δίχα, 750
εἰς χεῖρα Τεύκρου δεξιὰν φιλοφρόνως
θεὸς εἶπε κάπεσκηψε παντοίᾳ τέχνῃ
εἶρξαι κατ' ἡμαρ τοῦμφανὲς τὸ νῦν τόδε
Αἶανθ' ὑπὸ σκηναῖσι μηδ' ἀφέντ' ἔαν,
εἰ ζῶντ' ἐκείνον εἰσιδεῖν θέλοι ποτέ. 755

728 μὴ οὐ LKaSu: μὴ A πέτροισι ωSu: -ησι QCFHN^{pc}Zc^s: -αισι O
731 προσωτάτω LKSu: -άτου a 733 ἡμιν Planudes: ἡμῖν Jb: ἡμῖν ω
ὡς] ῥ Dawe 737 ἰοῦ bis Triclinius, Q: quater N: ter ω 738 βραδεῖαν]
μάταιον Nauck: ἀχρεῖον Schmidt 739 φάνην] φάνην D 742 παρῑ-
ναι Hartung: παρῑκειν ω: παρῑκείν H, Reiske τύχη LKa: -οι GRHZc¹⁸
743 κέρδιον K^{ac2}: -ιστον LK^{pc}a 747 δ' εἰδὼς] δέδιας Reiske πέρι]
πάρεi Schneidewin 748 οἶδα καὶ] οἶδ' ἐπεὶ Blaydes 753 εἶρξαι D, Σ^D,
Su: εἶ- LKaSu 755 θέλοι Π³ω: -εἰ D

ἐλᾷ γὰρ αὐτὸν τήνδ' ἔθ' ἡμέραν μόνην
 δίας Ἀθάνας μῆνις, ὥς ἔφη λέγων.
 τὰ γὰρ περισσὰ κἀνόνητα σώματα
 πίπτειν βραείαις πρὸς θεῶν δυσπραξίαις
 ἔφασχ' ὁ μάντις, ὅστις ἀνθρώπου φύσιν 760
 βλαστῶν ἔπειτα μὴ κατ' ἀνθρώπον φρονῇ.
 κείνος δ' ἅπ' οἴκων εὐθύς ἐξορμώμενος
 ἄνους καλῶς λέγοντος ἡγύρεθη πατρός.
 ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐννέπει, “τέκνον, δορὶ
 βούλου κρατεῖν μὲν, σὺν θεῶ δ' αἰεὶ κρατεῖν.” 765
 ὁ δ' ὑψικόμπως κἀφρόνως ἡμείψατο,
 “πάτερ, θεοῖς μὲν κἂν ὁ μηδὲν ὦν ὁμοῦ
 κράτος κατακτήσασαίτ'. ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ δίχα
 κείνων πέποιθα τοῦτ' ἐπισπάσειν κλέος.”
 τοσόνδ' ἐκόμπει μῦθον. εἶτα δεῦτερον 770
 δίας Ἀθάνας, ἡνίκ' ὀτρύνουσά νιν
 ἡυδᾷτ' ἐπ' ἐχθροῖς χεῖρα φοινίαν τρέπειν,
 τότε ἀντιφωνεῖ δεινὸν ἄρρητόν τ' ἔπος·
 “ἄνασσα, τοῖς ἄλλοισιν Ἀργείων πέλας
 ἴστω, καθ' ἡμᾶς δ' οὐποτ' ἐκρήξει μάχη.” 775
 τοιοῖσδέ τοι λόγοισιν ἀστεργῇ θεᾷς
 ἐκτήσατ' ὄργην, οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπον φρονῶν.
 ἀλλ' εἶπερ ἔστι τῇδ' ἔθ' ἡμέρα, τάχ' ἂν
 γενοίμεθ' αὐτοῦ σὺν θεῶ σωτήριοι.
 τοσαῦθ' ὁ μάντις εἶφ' ὁ δ' εὐθύς ἐξ ἔδρας 780

756 τήνδ' ἔθ' ἡμέραν μόνην Pearson:] ἡμέραν μόνην Π³: τῇδε θ' (ἔθ' Zu, Markland) ἡμέρα μόνη ω **757** ὥς DZr: ὡς La **758** κἀνόνητα ωΣStSuEu: κἀνόητα Zc^{ac}, Chalcondylas: ἄφρονα ^{sl}D **759** βραείαις... δυσπραξίαις ωStSu: -α -α Π³: β... δυσπραγίαις St **760** φύσιν Π³ω: φύσει St **761** βλαστῶν ωSt: γεγώς Eu φρονῇ Π³LKStEu, fort. D^{ac}: -εἶ a **763** ἡγύρεθη Dindorf: εὐ- Π³ω **764** δορὶ] δόρει Dindorf **768** κατακτήσασαίτ' K^{is}aSu: καταστήσασαίτ' L^{ac}Kⁱ **770** δεῦτερον] δ' ἀντίον Jebb **771** δίας Ἀθάνας] -αν -αν Mehlhorn **773** τότε La: τόδ' H, Pierson ἀντιφωνεῖ La: ἀντεφώνει C^{up}FNV, ed. Lond. 1722 **775** ἐκρήξει ωEu: εἶσ- West: ἐν- Lloyd-Jones et Wilson **776** τοι Valckenaer: τοῖς ω **778** ἔθ' Zu, Markland: θ' L^{up}La: ἐν L^{ac}K **780** τοσαῦθ' a: τοιαῦθ' LK εἶφ' A^{ac}XrXsZr: εἶπεν {L} KA^{up}D

- πέμπει μέ σοι φέροντα τάσδ' ἐπιστολάς
 Τεῦκρος φυλάσσειν. εἰ δ' ἀπεστερήμεθα,
 οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ κείνος, εἰ Κάλχας σοφός.
- Χο. ὦ δαῖτα Τέκμησσα, δυσμόρων γένος,
 ὅρα μολοῦσα τόνδ' ὅποι' ἔπη θροεῖ. 785
 ξυρεῖ γὰρ ἐν χρῶ τοῦτο μὴ χαίρειν τινά.
- Τεκ. τί μ' αὖ τάλαιναν, ἀρτίως πεπταυμένην
 κακῶν ἀτρύτων, ἐξ ἔδρας ἀνίστατε;
- Χο. τοῦδ' εἰσάκουε τάνδρός, ὡς ἦκει φέρων
 Αἴαντος ἡμῖν πράξιν ἣν ἤλγησ' ἐγώ. 790
- Τεκ. οἴμοι, τί φῆς, ἀνθρωπε; μῶν ὀλώλαμεν;
 Αγγ. οὐκ οἶδα τὴν σὴν πράξιν, Αἴαντος δ' ὅτι,
 θυραῖος εἶπερ ἔστιν, οὐ θαρσῶ πέρει.
- Τεκ. καὶ μὴν θυραῖος, ὥστε μ' ὠδίνειν τί φῆς.
 Αγγ. ἐκείνον εἶργειν Τεῦκρος ἐξεφίεται 795
 σκηνῆς ὕπαυλον μὴδ' ἀφίεναι μόνον.
- Τεκ. ποῦ δ' ἔστι Τεῦκρος, κάπτι τῷ λέγει τάδε;
 Αγγ. πάρεστ' ἐκεῖνος ἄρτι· τήνδε δ' ἔξοδον
 ὄλεθρον εἰς Αἴαντος ἐλπίζει φέρειν.
- Τεκ. οἴμοι τάλαινα, τοῦ ποτ' ἀνθρώπων μαθῶν;
 Αγγ. τοῦ Θεστορείου μάντεως, καθ' ἡμέραν
 ἱτὴν νῦν ὅτ' αὐτῷ θάνατον ἢ βίον φέρει.
- Τεκ. οἷ' γώ, φίλοι, πρόστιτ' ἀναγκαίας τύχης,
 καὶ σπεύσασθ' οἱ μὲν Τεῦκρον ἐν τάχει μολεῖν,
 οἱ δ' ἐσπέρους ἀγκῶνας, οἱ δ' ἀντηλίους 805
 ζητεῖτ' ἰόντες τάνδρος ἔξοδον κακὴν.
 ἐγνωνκα γὰρ δὴ φωτὸς ἡπατημένη
 καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς χάριτος ἐκβεβλημένη.

781-2 πέμπει... Τεῦκρος] permut. Schmidt 782 ἀπεστερήμεθα] ἄρ'
 ὑστερήμεθα Schenkl: ἄρ' ὑστερήσαμεν Badham 783 ἔστιν] ἔστ' ἔθ' Heim-
 soeth ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀν- ὦ 784 δυσμόρων Paehler: -ον ὦ Su γένος
 ὦ Su: τέκος Dawe 790 πράξιν ὦ Eu: βάξιν Reiske 791 οἴμοι] ὦμοι
 V ἀνθρωπε L^{ac}K: ὠνθρωπε L^{pc}a 794 μὴν L^{pc}Ka: νῦν L^{ac}Λ post
 θυραῖος add. γ' Elmsley 795 εἶργειν C, Blaydes: εἶ- ὦ 799 ὄλεθρον
 εἰς Blaydes: ὄλεθρίαν ὦ 802 ὅτ' La: ἦτ' K: ἦτις gl. in nonnullis 805
 ἀντηλίους LDxS.Zr.Sr: ἀνθη- (A)Xr 806 τάνδρος LK.Sr: ἀνδρὸς a

- οἴμοι, τί δράσω, τέκνον; οὐχ ἰδρυτέον.
 ἀλλ' εἴμι κάγω κείσ' ὅποιπερ ἄν σθένω. 810
 χωρῶμεν, ἐγκονῶμεν, οὐχ ἔδρας ἀκμή
 [σῶζειν θέλοντες ἄνδρα γ' ὃς σπεύδῃ θανεῖν].
 Χο. χωρεῖν ἔτοιμος, κοῦ λόγῳ δείξω μόνον.
 τάχος γὰρ ἔργου καὶ ποδῶν ἅμ' ἔψεται.
 Αἰ. ὁ μὲν σφαγεὺς ἔστηκεν ἥ τομώτατος 815
 γένοιτ' ἄν, εἴ τῳ καὶ λογίζεσθαι σχολή,
 δῶρον μὲν ἀνδρὸς Ἑκτορος ξένων ἐμοὶ
 μάλιστα μισηθέντος, ἐχθίστου θ' ὄρᾱν.
 πέπηγε δ' ἐν γῇ πολεμία τῇ Τρωάδι,
 σιδηροβρῶτι θηγάνη νεκρονής· 820
 ἔπηξα δ' αὐτὸν εὖ περιστείλας ἐγώ,
 εὐνούστατον τῷδ' ἀνδρὶ διὰ τάχους θανεῖν.
 οὕτω μὲν εὐσκευοῦμεν· ἐκ δὲ τῶνδέ μοι
 σὺ πρῶτος, ὦ Ζεῦ, καὶ γὰρ εἰκός, ἄρκεσον.
 αἰτήσομαι δέ σ' οὐ μακρὸν γέρας λαβεῖν. 825
 πέμψον τιν' ἡμῖν ἄγγελον, κακὴν φάτιν
 Τεύκρῳ φέροντα, πρῶτος ὥς με βαστάσῃ
 πεπτῶτα τῷδε περὶ νεορράντῳ ξίφει,
 καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἐχθρῶν του κατοπτευθεὶς πάρος
 ῥιφθῶ κυσὶν πρόβλητος οἰωνοῖς θ' ἔλωρ. 830
 τοσαῦτά σ', ὦ Ζεῦ, προστρέπω· καλῶ δ' ἅμα
 πομπαῖον Ἑρμῇ χθόνιον εὖ με κοιμίσει,
 ξὺν ἀσφαδάστῳ καὶ ταχεῖ πηδήματι
 πλευρὰν διαρρήξαντα τῷδε φασγάνῳ.
 καλῶ δ' ἄρωγούς τὰς αἰεὶ τε παρθένους 835

812-14 habent LKA'DXrXsZr: om. A^{ac} [**812**] del. Dindorf θέλον-
 τες **a**: -ας L, Hermann: θέλουσιν Wunder γ'] om. rHV ὃς **Ka**: ὃς ἄν
 L σπεύδῃ L: -εὶ **Ka** **813** post χωρεῖν add. γ' Xs **817** sic interp.
 Hermann: post Ἑκτορος ὦ **823** μοι] ἐμοὶ COV **825** γέρας λαβεῖν
 LK, inverso ordine G¹γ^pV^{ac}Zc: γέρας λαχεῖν **a**, inverso rV^{pc}JJb **827**
 Τεύκρῳ φέροντα] inverso ordine D^{7pc} **830** κυσὶν Zr: -σὶ LKa **831**
 σ', ὦ ὦ **Su**: σοι L¹γ^p, l^mΣ^{GRV} προστρέπω L^{ac}L¹γ^pΣ: προτ- L^{pc}Ka **Su** **833**
 ἀσφαδάστῳ Nauck: -άστῳ ὦ **Su** **834** διαρρήξαντα ὦ **Su**: ἀνα- Σ^L

αἰέ θ' ὀρώσας πάντα τὰν βροτοῖς πάθη,
 σεμνὰς Ἑρινύς τανύποδας, μαθεῖν ἐμὲ
 πρὸς τῶν Ἀτρειδῶν ὡς διόλλυμαι τάλας.
 [καὶ σφας κακοὺς κάκιστα καὶ πανωλέθρους
 ξυναρπάσειαν, ὥσπερ εἰσορῶσ' ἐμὲ
 αὐτοσφαγῇ πίπτοντα· τὼς αὐτοσφαγεῖς
 πρὸς τῶν φιλίστων ἐγόνων ὀλοίατο.]
 ἴτ', ὦ ταχεῖαι ποίνιμοί τ' Ἑρινύες,
 γεύεσθε, μὴ φείδεσθε πανδήμου στρατοῦ.
 σὺ δ', ὦ τὸν αἰπὺν οὐρανὸν διφρηλατῶν
 Ἥλιε, πατρῶαν τὴν ἐμήν ὅταν χθόνα
 ἴδῃς, ἐπισχὼν χρυσόνωτον ἥνιαν
 ἄγγειλον ἄτας τὰς ἐμὰς μόρον τ' ἐμὸν
 γέροντι πατρὶ τῇ τε δυστήνῳ τροφῷ.
 ἧ που τάλαινα, τήνδ' ὅταν κλύῃ φάτιν,
 ἦσει μέγαν κωκυτὸν ἐν πάσῃ πόλῃ.
 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἔργον ταῦτα θρηνεῖσθαι μάτην·
 ἀλλ' ἄρκτέον τὸ πρᾶγμα σὺν τάχει τινί.
 [ὦ θάνατε θάνατε, νῦν μ' ἐπίσκεψαι μολῶν·
 καίτοι σὲ μὲν κᾶκεῖ προσανδῆσω ξυνών.
 σὲ δ' ὦ φαεννῆς ἡμέρας τὸ νῦν σέλας,
 καὶ τὸν διφρευτήν Ἥλιον προσεννέπω,
 πανύστατον δὴ κοῦποτ' αὔθις ὕστερον.]
 ὦ φέγγος, ὦ γῆς ἱερὸν οἰκείας πέδον
 Σαλαμῖνος, ὦ πατρῶον ἐστίας βᾶθρον,
 κλειναὶ τ' Ἀθῆναι, καὶ τὸ σύντροφον γένος,
 κρηναὶ τε ποταμοὶ θ' οἶδε, καὶ τὰ Τρωικὰ
 πεδία προσανδῶ, χαίρετ', ὦ τροφῆς ἐμοί·

836 versum om. AX^rac Su θ' JJb, Livineii 'p': δ' ω **837** Ἑρινύς LK:
 -vv- aSu [839-42] del. Wesseling: habent ωSuEu [840] ὥσπερ
 ωSu: χῶσπερ Blaydes [842] post ἐγόνων habent τ' JJb, Markland
843 Ἑρινύες LK: -vv- aSu **844** γεύεσθε ωSu: κεντέιτε Thomas Magis-
 ter **851** πόλῃ West: πόλει ω [854-8] del. Campe: habent ω **859**
 οἰκείας] οἰκοῦντες F^{7p}H^{7p} **863** τροφῆς Wunder: τρωφῆς Q^{ac}: τροφεῖς ω

τοῦθ' ὕμιν Αἴας τοῦπος ὕστατον θροεῖ,
τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐν Αἰδου τοῖς κάτω μυθήσομαι. 865

ΗΜΙΧΟΡΙΟΝ Α

πόνος πόνω πόνον φέρει.
πᾶ πᾶ
πᾶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔβαν ἐγώ;
κούδεις ἐπίσταται †με συμμαθεῖν† τόπος.
ἰδοῦ ἰδοῦ· 870
δοῦπον οὐ κλύω τινά;

ΗΜΙΧΟΡΙΟΝ Β

ἡμῶν γε ναὸς κοινόπλουν ὁμιλίαν.
Ημ. α τί οὖν δῆ;
Ημ. β πᾶν ἐστίβηται πλευρὸν ἔσπερον νεῶν.
Ημ. α ἔχεις οὖν; 875
Ημ. β πόνου γε πληῆθος κούδεν εἰς ὄψιν πλέον.
Ημ. α ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ τὴν ἀφ' ἡλίου βολῶν
κέλευθον ἀνὴρ οὐδαμοῦ δηλοῖ φανείς.
Χο. τίς ἂν δῆτά μοι, τίς ἂν φιλοπόνων 879/80 [str.
ἄλιαδᾶν ἔχων ἀύπνους ἄγρας 880/1
ἢ τίς Ὀλυμπιάδων θεᾶν, ἢ ῥυτῶν 882/3
Βοσπορίων ποταμῶν, 884
τὸν ὠμόθυμον εἴ ποθι 885/6
πλαζόμενον λεύσσω 886/7
ἀπύοι; σχέτλια γὰρ 887/8

864 ὕμιν Schaefer: ὕμιν ω **867** πᾶ πᾶ] παπαῖ Lachmann et Reisig
869 locus desperatus **871** οὐ Firnhaber: αὖ ω notam interrogationis
pos. Wolff **877** οὐδὲ μὲν LK: οὐδ' ἐμοὶ **a** βολῶν L^sK^{pc} **a**: -ῆς **1**:
μολῶν rFH^{yp}PVZc: μολῶν CN **878** ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἄν- ω **879/80**
δῆτα Hermann: δῆ ω **880/1** ἄγρας ωΛ: ἔδρας A^{1yp}D^{yp} **882/3**
Ὀλυμπιάδων] -αδᾶν N sine accentu, Elmsley θεᾶν LK¹: θεῶν K^s **a** **884**
ποταμῶν Jb, Mosq. gr. 504, codex Dresdensis: ποταμῶν ἴδρις ω: π**α ἴδρις
μῶν Q

	ἐμέ γε τὸν μακρῶν ἀλάτταν πόνων	888
	οὐρίῳ μὴ πελάσαι δρόμῳ,	
	ἀλλ' ἀμενηνὸν ἄνδρα μὴ λεύσσειν ὄπου.	890
Τεκ.	ἰὼ μοί μοι.	
Χο.	τίνος βοή πάραυλος ἐξέβη νάπους;	
Τεκ.	ἰὼ τλήμων.	
Χο.	τὴν δουρίληπτον δύσμορον νύμφην ὀρῶ Τέκμησαν, οἴκτῳ τῷδε συγκεκραμένην.	895
Τεκ.	οἴχωκ', ὄλωλα, διαπεπόρθημαι, φίλοι.	
Χο.	τί δ' ἔστιν;	
Τεκ.	Αἴας ὃδ' ἡμῖν ἀρτίως νεοσφαγῆς κεῖται, κρυφαίῳ φασγάνῳ περιπτυχῆς.	
Χο.	ῥῆμοι ἐμῶν νόστων· ῥῆμοι, κατέπεφνες, ἄναξ, τόνδε συνναύταν, τάλας· ὦ ταλαίφρων γυνή.	900
Τεκ.	ὡς ὧδε τοῦδ' ἔχοντος αἰάζειν πάρα.	
Χο.	τίνος ποτ' ἄρ' ἔπραξε χειρὶ δύσμορος;	905
Τεκ.	αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοῦ, δῆλον· ἐν γάρ οἱ χθονὶ πηκτὸν τόδ' ἔγχος περιπετοῦς κατηγορεῖ.	
Χο.	ῥῆμοι ἐμᾶς ἄτας. οἶος ἄρ' ῥμάχθης, ἄφαρκτος φίλων· ἐγὼ δ' ὁ πάντα κωφός, ὁ πάντ' αἰδρις, κατημέλησα. πᾶ πᾶ	908/9 910

889 οὐρίῳ... δρόμῳ **aΣ**: -ων -ων L^{ac}K **890** ἀμενηνόν] μεμνηνόντ' NP^{gl}Δ, Musgrave **891** ἰὼ semel CHVJ: bis ὠ: ter Zc **893** τλήμων] τλήμον CH^P **894** δουρίληπτον ADXrXsZr^{pc}: δορ- LKZr^{ac} **895** οἴκτῳ] οἴτῳ J^p **896** οἴχωκ' ὠSu: ὠχωκ' H **900, 901** ῥῆμοι scripsi: ὦμοι Triclinius: ἰὼ μοι ὠΛ **901** κατέπεφνες ἄναξ] inverso ordine Hermann **902** τόνδε <τὸν> Triclinius τόλας Hermann: ὦ τόλας Triclinius: ἰὼ τόλας ὠ **903** ὦ Dawe (nol. Jebb): ὦ Triclinius: ἰὼ ὠ ταλαίφρων L^{pc}**a**: ταλαίφρον KXr γυνή COV: γύναι ὠ **905** ἄρ] del. Wolff ἔπραξε] ἔρξε Hermann: ἔπεσε Blaydes **906** αὐτοῦ LK: αὐ- **a** **907** περιπετοῦς Musgrave: -τὲς ὠSu **908/9** ῥῆμοι scripsi: ὦμοι Triclinius: ἰὼ μοι ὠ οἶος LK**a**: οἶος Zr: οἶον Blaydes ῥμάχθης Radermacher: αἰ- ὠ: ἦμ- H, fort. C^{ac} **910** ἄφαρκτος Dindorf: ἄφρακτος ὠΛ

- κεῖται ὁ δυστράπελος
 δυσώνυμος Αἴας;
 Τεκ. οὔτοι θεατός· ἀλλὰ νιν περιπτυχεῖ 915
 φάρει καλύψω τῷδε παμπήδην, ἐπεὶ
 οὔδεις ἄν, ὅστις καὶ φίλος, τλαίῃ βλέπειν
 [φυσῶντ' ἄνω πρὸς ῥίνας ἔκ τε φοινίας
 πληγῆς μελανθὲν αἶμ' ἀπ' οἰκείας σφαγῆς].
 οἴμοι, τί δράσω; τίς σε βαστάσει φίλων; 920
 ποῦ Τεῦκρος; ὥς ἀκμαῖ' ἄν, εἰ βαίῃ, μόλοι,
 πεπτῶτ' ἀδελφὸν τόνδε συγκαθαρμόσαι.
 ᾧ δύσμορ' Αἴας, οἷος ὦν οἷωσ' ἔχεις·
 ὥς καὶ παρ' ἐχθροῖς ἄξιος θρήνων τυχεῖν.
 Χο. ἔμελλες, τάλας, ἔμελλες χρόνω 925/6 [ant.
 στερεόφρων ἄρ' ἐξανύσσειν κακὰν 926/7
 μοῖραν ἀπειρεσίων πόνων· τοῖά μοι 928/9
 πάννουχα καὶ φαέθοντ' 930
 ἀνεστέναζες ὠμόφρων
 ἐχθοδόπ' Ἀτρείδαις
 οὐλίῳ σὺν πάθει.
 μέγας ἄρ' ἦν ἐκεῖνος ἄρχων χρόνος
 πημάτων, ἦμος ἀριστόχειρ 935
 <—υ—> ὀπλων ἔκειτ' ἄγῶν πέρι.
 Τεκ. ἰὼ μοί μοι.
 Χο. χωρεῖ πρὸς ἦπαρ, οἶδα, γενναία δύη.
 Τεκ. ἰὼ μοί μοι.
 Χο. οὐδέν σ' ἀπιστῶ καὶ δις οἰμῶξαι, γύναι, 940
 τοιοῦδ' ἀποβλαφθεῖσαν ἀρτίως φίλου.
 Τεκ. σοὶ μὲν δοκεῖν ταῦτ' ἔστ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἄγαν φρονεῖν.
 Χο. ξυναυδῶ.

914 δυσώνυμος D: ὁ δυσώνυμος LKa.Su [918–19] del. Nauck **920**
 βαστάσει K: —η La **921** ἀκμαῖ' ἄν Wakefield: ἀκμαῖος Π⁴ωSu: ἀκμήν
 ἄν Vauvilliers **923–4** Tecmessae trib. ω: choro GR^{ac}J **923** Αἴας]
 Αἴαν Su **924** ἐχθροῖς ωSu: —ων QRPJJb **926/7** ἐξανύσσειν L: —ύσειν
 Π⁴Ka **931** ἀνεστέναζες] ἄρ' ἐστέναζες JJb **936** lacunam pos. Triclin-
 ius: <χρυσοτύπων> Campbell ἄγῶν ωSu: ἄγῶν Wunder **937, 939**
 ἰώ] bis OV **941** ἀρτίως ωSuEu: —ίου L^s, Σ

- Τεκ. οἶμοι, τέκνον, πρὸς οἷα δουλείας ζυγὰ
χωροῦμεν, οἷοι νῶν ἐφεστᾶσι σκοποί. 945
- Χο. ὦμοι, ἀναλγήτων
δισσῶν ἐθρόησας ἄναυδ'
ἔργ' Ἀτρεϊδᾶν τῷδ' ἄχει.
ἀλλ' ἀπείργοι θεός.
- Τεκ. οὐκ ἂν τάδ' ἔστη τῇδε μὴ θεῶν μέτα. 950
- Χο. ἄγαν ὑπερβριθὲς <~> ἄχθος ἥνυσαν.
- Τεκ. τοιόνδε μέντοι Ζηνὸς ἢ δεινὴ θεὸς
Παλλὰς φυτεύει πῆμ' Ὀδυσσεώς χάριν.
- Χο. ἧ ῥα κελαινῶπαν θυμὸν ἐφυβρίζει 954/5
πολύτλας ἀνήρ, 956
γελᾷ δὲ τοῖσδε μαινομένοις ἄχεσιν
πολὺν γέλωτα, φεῦ φεῦ,
ζύν τε διπλοῖ βασιλῆς
κλύοντες Ἀτρεΐδαι. 960
- Τεκ. οἱ δ' οὖν γελώντων κάπιχαιρόντων κακοῖς
τοῖς τοῦδ' ἴσως τοι, κεῖ βλέποντα μὴ πτόθουν,
θανόντ' ἂν οἰμώξειαν ἐν χρεῖα δορός.
οἱ γὰρ κακοὶ γνῶμαισι τάγαθὸν χεροῖν
ἔχοντες οὐκ ἴσασι πρίν τις ἐκβάλλῃ. 965
[ἔμοι πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἡ κείνοις γλυκύς,
αὐτῷ δὲ τερπνός· ὦν γὰρ ἡράσθη τυχεῖν
ἐκτῆσθ' αὐτῷ, θάνατον ὄνπερ ἤθελεν.
τί δῆτα τοῦδ' ἐπεγγελῶεν ἂν κάτα;

946 ὦμοι LK: ὦμοι aSu: ἰώ μοι L^{γρ} **947-8** ἄναυδ' ἔργ' Hermann: ἄναυδον ἔργον ωSu **951** ἄγαν LrZr: post ἄγαν habent γ' KDXrXs, δ' A, alterutrum Π⁴²: καὶ μὴν ἄγαν Triclinius ἄχθος Π⁴ωSu: τε ἄχθος r: γὰρ ἄχθος Elmsley: γε τᾶχθος Blaydes ἥνυσαν ωSu: -εν QH³: -ας JJb **954/5** κελαινῶπαν θυμὸν Π⁴LKa: -ῶπα -ον OΔWa^{ac}WbHeEu: -ὄν -ὄν Su: -ῶπα -ῶ Lloyd-Jones et Wilson (-η iam Wesseling) **956** πολύτλας WaWb, Porson: ὁ πολύτλας Π⁴²ωSu **957** τοῖσδε Elmsley: τοῖσι Triclinius: τοῖς Π⁴ω **959** βασιλῆς Livineii p': -ῆς Par. gr. 2820: -ῆς ω **961** οἱ δ' L^{ac}, Hermann: οἱ δ' ASu: οἱδ' Ka οὖν] αὖ QSu **964** τάγαθὸν ωStSu: τᾶγάθ' ἐν JJaJb, Reiske: τᾶγαθὸν ἐν Q **[966-70]** del. Nauck: habent ωSuEu **[966]** ἦ] ἦ SuEu **969-73** choro trib. XrXsZr **[969]** τί LK: πῶς a τοῦδ' ἐπ-] τοῦδ' ἐτ' Meineke: τοῦδέ γ' Porson

θεοῖς τέθνηκεν οὗτος, οὐ κείνοισιν, οὐ.] 970
 πρὸς ταῦτ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν κενοῖς ὑβριζέτω.
 Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ
 λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους διοίχεται.

ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣ

- ἰὼ μοί μοι.
- Χο. σίγησον· αὐδὴν γὰρ δοκῶ Τεύκρου κλύειν 975
 βοῶντος ἄτης τῇσδ' ἐπίσκοπον μέλος.
- Τευ. ὦ φίλτατ' Αἴας, ὦ ξύναιμον ὅμμ' ἐμοί,
 ἄρ' ἠμπόληκας ὥσπερ ἡ φάτις κρατεῖ;
- Χο. ὄλωλεν ἀνὴρ, Τεῦκρε· τοῦτ' ἐπίστασο.
- Τευ. ὦμοι βαρείας ἄρα τῆς ἐμῆς τύχης. 980
- Χο. ὡς ὦδ' ἐχόντων — Τευ. ὦ τάλας ἐγώ, τάλας.
- Χο. πάρα στενάζειν. Τευ. ὦ περισπερχές πάθος.
- Χο. ἄγαν γε, Τεῦκρε. Τευ. φεῦ τάλας. τί γὰρ τέκνον
 τὸ τοῦδε; ποῦ μοι γῆς κυρεῖ τῆς Τρωάδος;
- Χο. μόνος παρὰ σκηναῖσιν. Τευ. οὐχ ὅσον τάχος 985
 δῆτ' αὐτὸν ἄξεις δεῦρο, μή τις ὡς κενῆς
 σκύμνον λεαίνης δυσμενῶν ἀναρπάσῃ;
 ἴθ', ἐγκόνει, σύγκαμνε. τοῖς θανοῦσί τοι
 φιλοῦσι πάντες κειμένοις ἐπεγγελαῖν.
- Χο. καὶ μὴν ἔτι ζῶν, Τεῦκρε, τοῦδ' ἐσσι μέλειν 990
 ἐφίεθ' ἀνὴρ κείνος, ὥσπερ οὖν μέλει.
- Τευ. ὦ τῶν ἀπάντων δὴ θεαμάτων ἐμοὶ
 ἄλγιστον ὦν προσεῖδον ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐγώ,
 ὁδός θ' ὁδῶν πασῶν ἀνιάσασα δὴ
 μάλιστα τοῦμὸν σπλάγχχον, ἣν δὴ νῦν ἔβην, 995
 ὦ φίλτατ' Αἴας, τὸν σὸν ὡς ἐπησθόμην
 μόρον διώκων κάξιχνοσκοπούμενος.

979 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀν- ὦ 980 ὦμοι L: ὦμοι Ka 982 ὦ Dawe: ὦ ὦ
 988 θανοῦσι] νοσοῦσι J: ἐχθροῖσι Herwerden: σθένουσι Seyffert 991
 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἀνὴρ ὦ 994 πασῶν L^{pc} a: ἀπασῶν l

ὄξεϊα γάρ σου βάξις ὡς θεοῦ τινος
 διῆλθ' Ἀχαιοὺς πάντας ὡς οἶχη θανών.
 κἀγὼ κλυὼν δύστηνος ἐκποδὼν μὲν ὦν 1000
 ὑπεστέναζον, νῦν δ' ὄρων ἀπόλλυμαι.
 οἴμοι.
 ἴθ', ἐκκάλυψον, ὡς ἴδω τὸ πᾶν κακόν.
 ὦ δυσθέατον ὄμμα καὶ τόλμης πικρᾶς,
 ὅσας ἀνίας μοι κατασπείρας φθίνεις. 1005
 ποῖ γὰρ μολεῖν μοι δυνατόν, εἰς ποίους βροτούς,
 τοῖς σοῖς ἀρήξαντ' ἐν πόνοισι μηδαμοῦ;
 ἦ πού <με> Τελαμών, σὸς πατὴρ ἐμός θ' ἄμα,
 δέξαιτ' ἂν εὐπρόσωπος ἱλεώς τ' ἴσως
 χωροῦντ' ἄνευ σοῦ. πῶς γὰρ οὔχ; ὅτῳ πάρα 1010
 μηδ' εὐτυχοῦντι μηδὲν ἥδιον γελᾶν.
 οὗτος τί κρύψει; ποῖον οὐκ ἔρεϊ κακόν
 τὸν ἐκ δορὸς γεγῶτα πολεμίου νόθον,
 τὸν δειλὶα προδόντα καὶ κακανδρία
 σέ, φίλτατ' Αἴας, ἣ δόλοισιν, ὡς τὰ σὰ 1015
 κράτη θανόντος καὶ δόμους νέμοιμι σούς.
 τοιαῦτ' ἀνὴρ δύσσοργος, ἐν γήρα βαρὺς,
 ἔρεϊ, πρὸς οὐδὲν εἰς ἔριν θυμούμενος.
 τέλος δ' ἄπωστός γῆς ἀπορριφθήσομαι,
 δοῦλος λόγοισιν ἀντ' ἐλευθέρου φανείς. 1020
 τοιαῦτα μὲν κατ' οἶκον· ἐν Τροίᾳ δέ μοι
 πολλοὶ μὲν ἐχθροί, παῦρα δ' ὠφελήσιμα,
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἄφαντα σοῦ θανόντος ηὔρομην.

998 ὡς <ἐκ> Lloyd-Jones et Wilson **1000** κἀγὼ K^{pc}: ἀγὼ La κλυὼν West: κλύων ω δύστηνος I: δειλίας a μὲν ὦν L^{pc}K^{rs}a: μένων L^{ac}K^t
1005 κατασπείρας (-ες Λ) φθίνεις ωSu: κατασπείρεις φθίνων P^{bl}: κατέσπείρας φθίνων Blaydes **1006** μοι ωΛ: με ZuSu εἰς LKaSu: ἢ GRF: ἢ εἰς HPΔ
1008 <με> Küster: om. ωSu θ' ἄμα a: τ' ἴσως AKSu [L] **1009** τ' ἴσως ωSu: θ' ἄμα (C)H^{yp}P: τ' ἰδὼν Hermann (ἰδὼν Wa^{yp} ad 1008): τε σὼν Markland
1011 ἥδιον a: ἥδιστον JJb: ἱλεων ISu: ἴδιον HΔZc: ἱλεον fort. Q^{ipc} **1015** Αἴας] Αἴαν Su **1016** νέμοιμι LK^{ryp}a: ἔχοιμι K **1019** ἀπορριφθήσομαι L^{ac}DXsSu: -φήσομαι L^{pc}Ka **1022** παῦρα LK^{ac}a: παῦροι K^{pc}XrXsSu ὠφελήσιμα Johnson: -οι ωSu **1023** ταῦτ' ἄφαντα Jackson: ταῦτα πάντα ω: ταῦθ' ἅπαντα Eu ηὔρομην Dindorf: εὐ- ωEu

- οἷμοι, τί δράσω; πῶς σ' ἀποσπάσω πικροῦ
 τοῦδ' αἰόλου κνώδοντος; ὦ τάλας, ὕφ' οὗ
 1025 φονέως ἄρ' ἐξέπνευσας. εἶδες ὡς χρόνῳ
 ἔμελλέ σ' Ἔκτωρ καὶ θανῶν ἀποφθίσειν;
 [σκέψασθε, πρὸς θεῶν, τὴν τύχην δυοῖν βροτοῖν.
 Ἔκτωρ μὲν, ᾧ δὴ τοῦδ' ἐδωρήθη πάρα
 1030 ζωστῆρι πρισθεὶς ἱππικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγων
 ἐκνάπτετ' αἰέν, ἔστ' ἀπέψυξεν βίον·
 οὔτος δ' ἐκείνου τήνδε δωρεὰν ἔχων
 πρὸς τοῦδ' ὅλωλε θανασίμῳ πεσήμετι.
 ἄρ' οὐκ Ἑρινὺς τοῦτ' ἐχάλκευσε ξίφος
 1035 κἀκεῖνον Ἀιδης, δημιουργὸς ἄγριος;
 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν καὶ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ πάντ' αἰὲ
 φάσκοιμ' ἂν ἀνθρώποισι μηχανᾶν θεοῦ·
 ὅτῳ δὲ μὴ τάδ' ἐστὶν ἐν γνώμῃ φίλα,
 κεῖνός τ' ἐκεῖνα στεργέτω κἀγὼ τάδε.]
 Χο. μὴ τεῖνε μακράν, ἀλλ' ὅπως κρύψεις τάφῳ
 1040 φράζου τὸν ἄνδρα, χῶ τι μυθήσῃ τάχα.
 βλέπω γὰρ ἐχθρὸν φῶτα, καὶ τάχ' ἂν κακοῖς
 γελῶν ὃ δὴ κακοῦργος ἐξίκοιτ' ἀνήρ.
 Τευ. τίς δ' ἐστὶν ὄντιν' ἄνδρα προσλεύσσεις στρατοῦ;
 Χο. Μενέλαος, ᾧ δὴ τόνδε πλοῦν ἐστείλαμεν.
 1045 Τευ. ὁρῶ· μαθεῖν γὰρ ἐγγὺς ὦν οὐ δυσπετήης.

ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ

οὔτος, σὲ φωνῶ τόνδε τὸν νεκρὸν χεροῖν
 μὴ συγκομίζειν, ἀλλ' ἔαν ὅπως ἔχει.

1024 σ' KA^sXrXsZr: om. LA'DSu **1025** post κνώδοντος notam interrogationis pos. Tweedie **1027** ἀποφθίσειν ωSu: -ίσαι Hermann, Su [1028-39] del. Morstadt: habent ωSuEu [1029] τοῦδ' a: τοῦτ' LKSu [1030] πρισθεὶς ωSu: τρωθεὶς Wb (verum Wb^{79p}) [1031] ἐκνάπτετ' LKSu: ἐγν- fere a [1032] δωρεὰν ωSu: -εἶαν von Bamberg [1034] Ἑρινὺς LK: -vv- aSu [1035] Ἀιδης LKaSu: Ἄρης CFP^cHP [1036] οὖν LKZrSu: ἂν a [1039] τ' ἐκεῖνα ωSu: ἐκεῖνα r: τάκείνου HΔJJbSu: τ' ἐκείνου P **1040** κρύψεις a: -ης LK **1042** ἂν] ἂν ἐν PJJb: ἐν Hartung **1045** ἐστείλαμεν] -άμην L^c, Reiske

Τευ. τίνος χάριν τοσόνδ' ἀνήλωσας λόγον;
 Με. δοκοῦντ' ἐμοί, δοκοῦντα δ' ὅς κραίνει στρατοῦ. 1050
 Τευ. οὐκουν ἄν εἴποις ἦντιν' αἰτίαν προθεῖς;
 Με. ὀθούνεκ' αὐτὸν ἐλπίσαντες οἴκοθεν
 ἄγειν Ἀχαιοῖς ξύμμαχόν τε καὶ φίλον,
 ἐξηύρομεν ξυνόντες ἐχθίῳ Φρυγῶν·
 ὅστις στρατῷ ξύμπαντι βουλευσας φόνον 1055
 νύκτωρ ἐπεστράτευσεν, ὥς ἔλοι δορί·
 κεῖ μὴ θεῶν τις τήνδε πείραν ἔσβεσεν,
 ἡμεῖς μὲν ἄν τήνδ' ἦν ὅδ' εἴληχεν τύχην
 θανόντες ἄν προῦκείμεθ' αἰσχίστῳ μόρῳ,
 οὔτος δ' ἄν ἔζη. νῦν δ' ἐνήλλαξεν θεός 1060
 [τὴν τοῦδ' ὕβριν πρὸς μῆλα καὶ ποιίμνας πεσεῖν].
 ὦν οὔνεκ' αὐτὸν οὔτις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ σθένων
 τοσοῦτον ὥστε σῶμα τυμβεῦσαι τάφῳ,
 ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ χλωρὰν ψάμαθον ἐκβεβλημένος
 ὄρνισι φορβὴ παραλίῳις γενήσεται. 1065
 πρὸς ταῦτα μηδὲν δεινὸν ἐξάρης μένος.
 εἰ γὰρ βλέποντος μὴ δυνήθημεν κρατεῖν,
 πάντως θανόντος γ' ἄρξομεν, κἄν μὴ θέλῃς,
 χερσὶν παρευθύνοντες. οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπου 1070
 λόγων γ' ἀκοῦσαι ζῶν ποτ' ἠθέλησ' ἐμῶν.
 καίτοι κακοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἄνδρα δημότην
 μηδὲν δικαιοῦν τῶν ἐφεστῶτων κλύειν.
 οὐ γάρ ποτ' οὔτ' ἄν ἐν πόλῃ νόμοι καλῶς

1049 ἀνήλωσας] ἀνάλωσας VZb 1050 δ'] θ' Zc, Par. gr. 2794: om.
 HP 1051 οὐκουν Zc, Valckenaer: οὐκοῦν P: οὐκοῦν ω 1053 ἄγειν
 La: ἄζειν L'K 1054 ἐξηύρομεν Dindorf: ἐξεύρομεν ω ξυνόντες Reiske:
 ζητούντες ω: ζητοῦντ' ἔτ' Valckenaer 1056 ἔλοι δορί] ἔλοι δόρει G^{29c} Q,
 Reisig: ἐλοιδόρει V et γρ in LGFNO, ^{lm}Σ^L 1058-9 τήνδ'... ἄν del. Nauck
 1058 τήνδ'] τῇδ' Kousis τύχην] -η Lloyd-Jones et Wilson 1059
 θανόντες] λαχόντες Helvetius, Morstadt: φθάνοντες Seyffert αἰσχίστῳ]
 ἀθλίῳ rHΔ [1061] del. Nauck 1063 τοσοῦτον A^{19p}D^{19p}: τοιοῦτον
 ω 1065 παραλίῳις] -άλιος R, Naber 1066 ἐξάρης a: ἐξαίρης LK
 1068 γ'] om. rPAS 1070 λόγων γ' Campbell: λόγων τ' LK: λόγων a
 1071 ἄνδρα ωSt: ὄντα Reiske 1073 πόλῃ West: πόλει ω

- φέροιντ' ἄν, ἔνθα μὴ καθεστήκοι δέος,
 οὔτ' ἄν στρατός γε σωφρόνως ἄρχοιτ' ἔτι, 1075
 μηδὲν φόβου πρόβλημα μὴδ' αἰδοῦς ἔχων.
 ἀλλ' ἄνδρα χρή, κἄν σῶμα γεννήσῃ μέγα,
 δοκεῖν πεσεῖν ἄν κἄν ἀπὸ σμικροῦ κακοῦ.
 δέος γὰρ ᾧ πρόσσεστιν αἰσχύνη θ' ὁμοῦ,
 σωτηρίαν ἔχοντα τόνδ' ἐπίστασο· 1080
 ὅπου δ' ὑβρίζειν δρᾷν θ' ἄβούλεται παρῇ,
 ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν χρόνῳ ποτὲ
 ἐξ οὐρίων δραμοῦσαν εἰς βυθὸν πεσεῖν.
 ἀλλ' ἐστάτω μοι καὶ δέος τι καίριον,
 καὶ μὴ δοκῶμεν δρῶντες ἄν ἡδώμεθα 1085
 οὐκ ἀντιτείσειν αὐθις ἄν λυποίμεθα.
 ἔρπει παραλλὰς ταῦτα. πρόσθεν οὗτος ἦν
 αἰθων ὑβριστής, νῦν δ' ἐγὼ μέγ' αὖ φρονῶ.
 καὶ σοι προφωνῶ τόνδε μὴ θάπτειν, ὅπως
 μὴ τόνδε θάπτων αὐτὸς εἰς ταφὰς πέσῃς. 1090
 Χο. Μενέλαε, μὴ γνώμας ὑποστήσας σοφὰς
 εἴτ' αὐτὸς ἐν θανοῦσιν ὑβριστής γένῃ.
 Τευ. οὐκ ἄν ποτ', ἄνδρες, ἄνδρα θαυμάσαιμ' ἔτι,
 ὃς μὴδὲν ὦν γοναῖσιν εἶθ' ἀμαρτάνει,
 ὅθ' οἱ δοκοῦντες εὐγενεῖς πεφυκέναι 1095
 τοιαῦθ' ἀμαρτάνουσιν ἐν λόγοις ἔπη.
 ἄγ', εἴπ' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐθις, ἥ σὺ φῆς ἄγειν
 τόνδ' ἄνδρ' Ἀχαιοῖς δεῦρο σύμμαχον λαβών;
 οὐκ αὐτὸς ἐξέπλευσεν ὥς αὐτοῦ κρατῶν;
 ποῦ σὺ στρατηγεῖς τοῦδε; ποῦ δὲ σοὶ λεῶν 1100

1074 καθεστήκοι A¹⁸ XrXsZr: -κη L^{pc} KA¹: -κει D, Heath: -κε rCV^{ac2} Zf, unde
 -ken Brunck: παρεστήκη, -ει S^t [L^{ac}] **1075** ἀρχοιτ' ἔτι Ka: ἔχοιτ' ἔτι L:
 ἀρχοιτό τις H **1077** μέγα] μέγας Scaliger **1081** παρῇ LKSt: πάρα a
1083 ἐξ] κάς Morstadt οὐρίων] -ίας S^t εἰς] ἐς FS^t **1086** ἀντιτεί-
 σειν Nauck: ἀντιτίσειν ωS^t αὐθις] αὐτὶς S^t λυποίμεθα Linwood: -ώμεθα
 ω **1087** ἔρπει] ῥέπει Mekler **1092** εἴτ'] μήτ' S^t **1094** ἀμαρτάνει]
 -οι Hartung: -η S^t **1096** λόγοις ἔπη] λόγοις: ἐπεὶ Markland **1098**
 τόνδ' L, Markland: τὸν Ka **1099** αὐτοῦ Ka: αὐ- LA **1100** λεῶν
 D^{pc}, Housman: λεῶν Ka: λαῶν L

- ἔξεστ' ἀνάσσειν ὧν ὄδ' ἡγεῖτ' οἴκοθεν;
 Σπάρτης ἀνάσσων ἤλθες, οὐχ ἡμῶν κρατῶν·
 οὐδ' ἔσθ' ὅπου σοὶ τόνδε κοσμήσαι πλέον
 ἀρχῆς ἔκειτο θεσμός ἢ καὶ τῷδε σέ.
 [ὑπαρχος ἄλλων δεῦρ' ἔπλευσας, οὐχ ὅλων
 στρατηγός, ὥστ' Αἴαντος ἡγεῖσθαι ποτε.] 1105
 ἀλλ' ὦνπερ ἄρχεις ἄρχε, καὶ τὰ σέμν' ἔπη
 κόλαζ' ἐκείνους· τόνδε δ', εἴτε μὴ σὺ φῆς
 εἶθ' ἄτερος στρατηγός, εἰς ταφὰς ἐγὼ
 θήσω δικαίως, οὐ τὸ σὸν δείσας στόμα. 1110
 οὐ γάρ τι τῆς σῆς οὔνεκ' ἐστρατεύσατο
 γυναικός, ὥσπερ οἱ πόνου πολλοῦ πλέω,
 ἀλλ' οὔνεχ' ὄρκων οἷσιν ἦν ἐπώμοτος,
 σοῦ δ' οὐδέν· οὐ γὰρ ἡξίου τοὺς μηδένας.
 πρὸς ταῦτα πλείους δεῦρο κήρυκας λαβῶν 1115
 καὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν ἦκε· τοῦ δὲ σοῦ φόφου
 οὐκ ἂν στραφείην, ἕως ἂν ἦς οἷός περ εἶ.
 Χο. οὐδ' αὖ τοιαύτην γλῶσσαν ἐν κακοῖς φιλῶ·
 τὰ σκληρὰ γάρ τοι, κἂν ὑπέρδικ' ἦ, δάκνει.
 Με. ὁ τοξότης ἔοικεν οὐ σμικρὸν φρονεῖν. 1120
 Τευ. οὐ γὰρ βάνανυσον τὴν τέχνην ἐκτησάμην.
 Με. μέγ' ἂν τι κομπάσεις, ἀσπίδ' εἰ λάβοις.
 Τευ. κἂν ψιλὸς ἀρκέσαιμι σοὶ γ' ὥπλισμένω.
 Με. ἡ γλῶσσά σου τὸν θυμὸν ὥς δεινὸν τρέφει.
 Τευ. ξὺν τῷ δικαίῳ γὰρ μέγ' ἔξεστιν φρονεῖν. 1125
 Με. δίκαια γὰρ τόνδ' εὐτυχεῖν κτείναντά με;
 Τευ. κτείναντα; δεινὸν γ' εἵπας, εἰ καὶ ζῆς θανών.
 Με. θεὸς γὰρ ἐκσῶζει με, τῷδε δ' οἴχομαι.

1101 ἡγεῖτ'] ἡγεν Porson: ἡγετ' anonymous: ἡγαγ' P, Elmsley 1104
 τῷδε σε ὦΛ: τοῦδέ σοι L⁷⁹K¹⁷⁹ [1105-6] del. Schneidewin: habent ὦSu
 1111-17 del. Reichard, 1111-14 Wecklein 1113 ἐπώμοτος KXrZr: ἐν-
 ADXs [L] 1117 ἕως ^gKDXrXs, Musgrave: ἔστ' S, Reiske: ὥς la
 1118-19 choro trib. ^cΣ, Heath: 1118 Menelao, 1119 Teucro ὦΛ 1120
 σμικρὸν {L^{ac}}, anonymous (nol. Lobeck): ἴδον Λ: σμικρὰ L^{pc}KaEu, Σ Ar. Ach.
 710 1124 δεινὸν] μέγαν K^m 1127 γ' a: τ' LK

- Τευ. μή νυν ἀτίμα θεούς, θεοῖς σεσωμένους.
 Με. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἂν ψέξαιμι δαιμόνων νόμους; 1130
 Τευ. εἰ τοὺς θανόντας οὐκ ἔξς θάπτειν παρών.
 Με. τοὺς γ' αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ πολέμιους· οὐ γὰρ καλόν.
 Τευ. ἦ σοὶ γὰρ Αἴας πολέμιος προὔστη ποτέ;
 Με. μισοῦντ' ἐμίσει· καὶ σὺ τοῦτ' ἠπίστασο.
 Τευ. κλέπτῃς γὰρ αὐτοῦ ψηφοποιὸς ἡνρέθης. 1135
 Με. ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς κοῦκ ἐμοί τόδ' ἐσφάλη.
 Τευ. πόλλ' ἂν καλῶς λάθῃς σὺ κλέψεαις κακά.
 Με. τοῦτ' εἰς ἀνίαν τοῦπος ἔρχεται τινι.
 Τευ. οὐ μᾶλλον, ὥς ἔοικεν, ἢ λυπήσομεν.
 Με. ἔν σοι φράσω· τόνδ' ἐστὶν οὐχὶ θαπτέον. 1140
 Τευ. σὺ δ' ἀντακούσῃ τοῦθ' ἔν, ὥς τεθάπεται.
 Με. ἤδη ποτ' εἶδον ἄνδρ' ἐγὼ γλώσση θρασὺν
 ναύτας ἐφορμήσαντα χεიმῶνος τὸ πλεῖν,
 ᾧ φθέγγμ' ἂν οὐκ ἐνηῦρες, ἡνίκ' ἐν κακῷ
 χεიმῶνος εἶχετ', ἀλλ' ὑφ' εἵματος κρυφαῖς 1145
 πατεῖν παρῆχε τῷ θέλοντι ναυτίλων.
 οὕτω δὲ καὶ σὲ καὶ τὸ σὸν λάβρον στόμα
 σμικροῦ νέφους ἀχ' ἂν τις ἐκπνεύσας μέγας
 χειμῶν κατασβέσειε τὴν πολλὴν βοήν.
 Τευ. ἐγὼ δὲ γ' ἄνδρ' ὅπως μωρίας πλέων, 1150
 ὃς ἐν κακοῖς ὕβριζε τοῖσι τῶν πέλας.
 κᾶτ' αὐτὸν εἰσιδὼν τις ἐμφερὲς ἐμοὶ
 ὀργήν θ' ὅμοιος εἶπε τοιοῦτον λόγον·
 “ὦνθρωπε, μὴ δρᾷ τοὺς τεθηγκότας κακῶς·

1129 νυν Lobeck: νῦν ὦ ἀτίμα] ἀτίμου vel ἄτιζε Elmsley σεσωμένος
 Wecklein: σεσωσ- ὦλ 1131 θανόντας <γ> Lenting 1132 αὐτοῦ
 LKD: αὐ- a 1134 ἐμίσει] ἐμίσειν Xr ἠπίστασο] ἐπ- D: ἐπίστασαι
 Zc⁹, Σ^{2c} 1135 ἡνρέθης Dindorf: εὐ- ὦ 1136 κοῦκ] οὐκ D 1137
 καλῶς L¹: κακῶς L³ Ka 1141 σὺ δ'] ἀλλ' LKZr τοῦθ' ἐν Valckenaer et
 Pierson: τοῦτον ὦ: τοῦθ' PJ 1144 φθέγγμ' scripsi post West: φθέγγμ' ὦ
 ἐνηῦρες Dindorf (ἐνεῦρες iam Hartung): ἂν εὔρες ὦ 1145 κρυφαῖς LADZr:
 κρυφθεῖς KXr^{gl} Xs: κρυβεῖς XrXs^{gl} 1146 ναυτίλων LKA^{pc} Zr et Synesius
 Epist. 4 p. 161: -φ A^{ac} DXrXs 1148 μέγας] μέγα D^{ac} 1154 ὦνθρωπε
 IXr: ἄν- aEu

- εἰ γὰρ ποιήσεις, ἴσθι πημανούμενος.” 1155
 τοιαῦτ’ ἄνολβον ἄνδρ’ ἐνουθέτει παρών.
 ὀρῶ δέ τοί νιν, κᾶστιν, ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ,
 οὐδεὶς ποτ’ ἄλλος ἢ σύ. μῶν ἦνιξάμην;
 Με. ἄπειμι· καὶ γὰρ αἰσχρόν, εἰ πύθοιτό τις 1160
 λόγοις κολάζειν ᾧ βιάζεσθαι πάρα.
 Τευ. ἄφερπέ νυν. κάμοι γὰρ αἰσχιστον κλύειν
 ἄνδρὸς ματαίου φλαῦρ’ ἔπη μυθουμένου.
 Χο. ἔσται μεγάλης ἔριδος τις ἀγών.
 ἀλλ’ ὥς δύνασαι, Τεῦκρε, ταχύνας 1165
 σπεῦσον κοίλην κάπετόν τιν’ ἰδεῖν
 τῷδ’, ἔνθα βροτοῖς τὸν ἀείμνηστον
 τάφον εὐρώεντα καθέξει.
 Τευ. καὶ μὴν ἐς αὐτὸν καιρὸν οἶδε πλησίοι 1170
 πάρεισιν ἄνδρὸς τοῦδε παῖς τε καὶ γυνή,
 τάφον περιστελοῦντε δυστήνου νεκροῦ.
 ὦ παῖ, πρόσελθε δεῦρο, καὶ σταθεὶς πέλας
 ἰκέτης ἔφαψαι πατρός, ὅς σ’ ἐγείνατο.
 θάκει δὲ προστρόπαιος ἐν χεροῖν ἔχων 1175
 κόμας ἐμὰς καὶ τῆσδε καὶ σαυτοῦ τρίτου,
 ἰκτῆριον θησαυρόν. εἰ δέ τις στρατοῦ
 βίᾳ σ’ ἀποσπάσειε τοῦδε τοῦ νεκροῦ,
 κακὸς κακῶς ἄθαπτος ἐκπέσοι χθονός,
 γένους ἅπαντος ῥίζαν ἐξημημένος,
 αὕτως ὅπωςπερ τόνδ’ ἐγὼ τέμνω πλόκον.
 ἔχ’ αὐτόν, ὦ παῖ, καὶ φύλασσε, μηδέ σε 1180
 κινήσάτω τις, ἀλλὰ προσπεσὼν ἔχου·
 ὑμεῖς τε μὴ γυναιῖκες ἀντ’ ἀνδρῶν πέλας
 παρέστατ’, ἀλλ’ ἀρήγετ’, ἔστ’ ἐγὼ μόλω
 τάφου μεληθεὶς τῷδε, κἂν μηδεὶς ἐᾷ.

1160 πάρα a: παρῇ *LS* 1161 νυν Stephanus: νῦν *ωΛ* 1165 τιν’
 ἰδεῖν] τεύχειν Schmidt: σκάπτειν Lloyd-Jones et Wilson 1168 πλησίοι]
 –ίον *Xr^{gl}* 1175 ἰκτῆριον *LaSi*: ἰκετ– *K* 1179 αὕτως *L*: αὐ– *KaSi*
 1182 τε] δὲ Blaydes 1183 μόλω] μολών *L^{ac}EM*: μόλων *Λ²* 1184 μελ-
 ηθεὶς *ωΛ*: –θῶ *EM*

Χο.	τίς ἄρα νέατος, ἐς πότε λή—	1185 [ant. 1]
	ξει πολυπλάγκτων ἐτέων ἀριθμός,	1185/6
	τὰν ἄπαυστον αἰὲν ἐμοὶ δορυσσοή—	1187/8
	των μόχθων ἄταν ἐπάγων	1188/9
	† ἀνὰ τὰν εὐρώδη Τροίαν, †	1190
	δύστανον ὄνειδος Ἑλλάνων;	
	ὄφελε πρότερον αἰθέρα δῦ—	[ant. 1]
	ναι μέγαν ἢ τὸν πολύκοινον Ἄιδαν	1192/3
	κεῖνος ἀνὴρ, ὅς στυγερῶν ἔδειξεν ὄπ—	1194/5
	λων Ἑλλασιν κοινὸν Ἄρη.	1195/6
	ὦ πόνοι πρόγονοι πόνων·	1197
	κεῖνος γὰρ ἔπερσεν ἀνθρώπους.	
	ἐκεῖνος οὔτε στεφάνων	1199 [str. 2]
	οὔτε βαθειᾶν κυλίκων	1200
	νεῖμεν ἐμοὶ τέρψιν ὀμιλεῖν,	1201
	οὔτε γλυκὺν αὐλῶν ὄτοβον δύσ—	1202/3
	μορος, οὔτ' ἐννυχίαν τέρψιν ἰαύειν·	1203/4
	ἑρώτων δ' ἑρώτων ἀπέπαυσεν, ὦμοι.	1205/6
	κεῖμαι δ' ἀμέριμνος οὔτως,	1207
	ἄει πυκιναῖς δρόσοις	
	τεγγόμενος κόμας,	
	λυγρᾶς μνήματα Τροίας.	1209/10
	καὶ πρὶν μὲν αἰὲν νυχίου	1211 [ant. 2]
	δείματος ἦν μοι προβολὰ	1212
	καὶ βελέων θούριος Αἴας·	1213

1187/8 ἄπαυστόν <γ> Triclinius δορυσσοήτων LK^{ac}: -σσόντων K^{pc} **a**
1190 ἀνὰ τὰν] ἂν τὰν Ahrens: τάνδ' ἀν' Lobeck εὐρώδη] εὐρυεδῇ Musgrave Τροίαν] Τροῖαν Dindorf **1192** ὄφελε P, Triclinius: ὦφ- ὦ Su
1194/5 ἀνὴρ Bothe: ἀ- ὦ Su **1195/6** Ἑλλασιν L: -σι Ka Su Ἄρη LKa Su: Ἄρην Zr Su **1197** ὦ Willink: ὦ Triclinius: ἰὼ ὦ **1199** οὔτε] οὐ Hermann **1200** βαθειᾶν LKA^s Zr: βαθειᾶν A'DXrXs **1202/3** ὄτοβον LK Su: ὄττοβον a δύσμορος] -μόρω Blaydes **1205/6** δ' hic GRQ, Bothe: post alterum ἑρώτων ὦ ἀπέπαυσεν] -σέ μ' S, Blaydes: ἀπέσπασέ μ' N: ἀπέσπασεν Zr ὦμοι Bothe: ὦμοι ὦ **1208** πυκιναῖς] πυκναῖς Xs **1209/10** λυγρᾶς Brunck: -ᾶς ὦ **1211** αἰὲν νυχίου Wolff: ἐννυχίου ὦ

νῦν δ' οὗτος ἀνεῖται στυγερῶ δαί—	1214/15
μονι. τίς μοι, τίς ἔτ' οὖν τέρψις ἐπέσται;	1215/16
γενοίμαν ἴν' ὕλαεν ἔπεστι πόντῳ	1217/18
πρόβλημ' ἀλίκλυστον, ἄκραν	1219
ὑπὸ πλάκα Σουνίου,	1220
τὰς ἱερὰς ὅπως	1221
προσείποimen Ἀθάνας.	1221/2
Τευ. καὶ μὴν ἰδὼν ἔσπευσα τὸν στρατηλάτην	1223
Ἀγαμέμνον' ἡμῖν δεῦρο τόνδ' ὀρμώμενον·	
δῆλος δέ μοῦστι σκαιὸν ἐκλύσων στόμα.	1225

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ

σὲ δὴ τὰ δεινὰ ῥήματ' ἀγγέλλουσί μοι	
τλῆναι καθ' ἡμῶν ὧδ' ἀνοιμωκτεῖ χανεῖν·	
σέ τοι, τὸν ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωτίδος λέγω.	
ἧ που τραφεῖς ἂν μητρὸς εὐγενοῦς ἄπο	
ὑψήλ' ἐφώνεις κάπ' ἄκρων ὠδοιπόροις,	1230
ὅτ' οὐδὲν ὦν τοῦ μηδὲν ἀντέστης ὕπερ,	
κοῦτε στρατηγούς οὔτε ναυάρχους μολεῖν	
ἡμᾶς Ἀχαιῶν οὔτε σοῦ διωμόσω,	
ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἄρχων, ὥς σὺ φῆς, Αἴας ἔπλει.	
ταῦτ' οὐκ ἀκούειν μεγάλα πρὸς δούλων κακά;	1235
ποίου κέκραγας ἀνδρὸς ὧδ' ὑπέρφρονα,	
ποῦ βάντος ἢ ποῦ στάντος οὔπερ οὐκ ἐγώ;	
οὐκ ἄρ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄνδρες εἰσὶ πλήν ὅδε;	
πικροὺς ἔοιγμεν τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὅπλων	
ἁγῶνας Ἀργεῖοισι κηρῦξαι τότε,	1240

1214/15 ἀνεῖται **a**: ἔγκειται K [L] **1215/16** ἐπέσται] ἔτ' ἔσται Blaydes
1217/18 ὕλαεν] ὕλων K^s πόντῳ Morstadt: —ου ω **1223–5** καὶ μὴν
Teucro trib. ω: choro H **1225** μοῦστι Elmsley: μοί' ὅτι ω καὶ δῆλός
ἔστιν ὥς τι σημανῶν νέον Σ^{LK} **1227** ἀνοιμωκτεῖ] —τὶ Eu **1228** τὸν
ἐκ] σὲ τὸν Dresd. Da. 22: σὲ τὸν ἐκ Zb: τὸν A **1230** ἐφώνεις L^{pc} **a**: ἐφρόνεις
L^{ac} K^{su} **1232** ναυάρχους ω Su: —ας KXs **1233** οὔτε] οὐδὲ Blaydes
διωμόσω] διωρίσω L^{γρ} K^{γρ} **1236** κέκραγας **a**: —ες LK **1237** prius
ποῦ ὦς: ποῖ Dresd. Da. 22, Valckenaer: πῇ Zr οὔπερ] ἤπερ HPΔ

- εἰ πανταχοῦ φανούμεθ' ἐκ Τεύκρου κακοί,
 κοῦκ ἀρκέσει ποθ' ὕμιν οὐδ' ἡσημένιοις
 εἶκιν ἅ τοῖς πολλοῖσιν ἤρεσκεν κριταῖς,
 ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἡμᾶς ἢ κακοῖς βαλεῖτέ που
 ἢ σὺν δόλῳ κεντήσεθ' οἱ λελειμμένοι. 1245
 ἐκ τῶνδε μέντοι τῶν τρόπων οὐκ ἂν ποτε
 κατάστασις γένοιτ' ἂν οὐδενὸς νόμου,
 εἰ τοὺς δίκη νικῶντας ἐξωθήσομεν
 καὶ τοὺς ὀπισθεν εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν ἄξομεν.
 ἀλλ' εἰρκτέον τάδ' ἐστίν· οὐ γὰρ οἱ πλατεῖς 1250
 οὐδ' εὐρύνωτοι φῶτες ἀσφαλέστατοι,
 ἀλλ' οἱ φρονοῦντες εὖ κρατοῦσι πανταχοῦ.
 μέγας δὲ πλευρὰ βοῦς ὑπὸ σμικρᾶς ὄμω
 μάστιγος ὀρθὸς εἰς ὁδὸν πορεύεται.
 καὶ σοὶ προσέρπον τοῦτ' ἐγὼ τὸ φάρμακον 1255
 ὀρῶ τάχ', εἰ μὴ νοῦν κατακτήσῃ τινά·
 ὃς τάνδρὸς οὐκέτ' ὄντος, ἀλλ' ἤδη σκιᾶς,
 θαρσῶν ὑβρίζεις κᾶξελευθεροστομεῖς.
 οὐ σωφρονήσεις; οὐ μαθὼν ὃς εἰ φύσιν
 ἄλλον τιν' ἄξεις ἄνδρα δεῦρ' ἐλεύθερον, 1260
 ὅστις πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀντὶ σοῦ λέξει τὰ σά;
 σοῦ γὰρ λέγοντος οὐκέτ' ἂν μάθοιμ' ἐγὼ·
 τὴν βάρβαρον γὰρ γλῶσσαν οὐκ ἐπαῖω.
 Χο. εἴθ' ὕμιν ἀμφοῖν νοῦς γένοιτο σωφρονεῖν·
 τούτου γὰρ οὐδὲν σφῶν ἔχω λῶον φράσαι. 1265
 Τευ. φεῦ, τοῦ θανόντος ὥς ταχεῖά τις βροτοῖς
 χάρις διαρρεῖ καὶ προδοῦς' ὀλίσκεται,
 εἰ σοῦ γ' ὄδ' ἀνήρ οὐδ' ἐπὶ σμικρὸν λόγον,

1241 φανούμεθ' LKAXr: φανοίμεθ' DXsZr, Σ^{Xr} **1242** ἀρκέσει] -σοι P
 ὕμιν Schneidewin: ὕμιν Zb^s: ὕμιν ω **1245** λελειμμένοι] λελημμένοι H,
 Pearson **1248** ἐξωθήσομεν aSt: ἐξω θήσομεν LKXs **1252** ἀλλ' οἱ] οἱ
 γὰρ Eu **1253** πλευρὰ (vel -ᾶ) LK.StEu: -ἂν a: -ἄς A **1257** τάνδρὸς
 Wecklein: ἄνδρὸς ω **1259** σωφρονήσεις] εὖ φρονήσεις K^{gl}: αὐ φρονήσεις
 L^s **1264** ὕμιν Schneidewin: ὕμιν ω **1266** τῖς] τοῖς D^{ac}: τοι Wright
1268 ἀνὴρ Brunck: ἄν- ω σμικρὸν λόγον Reiske: -ῶν-ων ω: -ὄν χρόνον
 Jaeger

Αἶας, ἔτ' ἴσχει μνηστίν, οὗ σὺ πολλάκις
 τήν σήν προτείνων προὔκαμες ψυχὴν δορί· 1270
 ἀλλ' οἴχεται δὴ πάντα ταῦτ' ἐρριμμένα.
 ὦ πολλὰ λέξας ἄρτι κἀνόητ' ἔπη,
 οὐ μνημονεύεις οὐκέτ' οὐδέν, ἥνίκα
 ἐρκέων ποθ' ὕμᾱς ἐντὸς ἐγκεκλημένους,
 ἦδη τὸ μηδὲν ὄντας ἐν τροπῇ δορός, 1275
 ἐρρύσατ' ἐλθὼν μοῦνος, ἀμφὶ μὲν νεῶν
 ἄκροισιν ἦδη ναυτικοῖς <θ>· ἐδωλίους
 πυρὸς φλέγοντος, εἰς δὲ ναυτικὰ σκάφη
 πηδῶντος ἄρδην Ἑκτορος τάφρων ὕπερ;
 τίς ταῦτ' ἀπεῖρξεν; οὐχ ὅδ' ἦν ὁ δρῶν τάδε, 1280
 ὃν οὐδαμοῦ φῆς, οὗ σὺ μή, βῆναι ποδί;
 ἄρ' ὕμιν οὗτος ταῦτ' ἔδρασεν ἐνδικα;
 χῶτ' αὐτίς αὐτὸς Ἑκτορος μόνος μόνου,
 λαχὼν τε κἀκέλευστος, ἦλθεν ἀντίος,
 οὐ δραπέτην τὸν κλῆρον ἐς μέσον καθεῖς, 1285
 ὕγρᾱς ἀρούρας βῶλον, ἀλλ' ὃς εὐλόφου
 κυνῆς ἔμελλε πρῶτος ἄλμα κουφιεῖν;
 ὅδ' ἦν ὁ πράσσων ταῦτα, σὺν δ' ἐγὼ παρών,
 ὁ δοῦλος, οὐκ τῆς βαρβάρου μητρὸς γεγώς.
 δύστηνε, ποῖ βλέπων ποτ' αὐτὰ καὶ θροεῖς; 1290
 οὐκ οἶσθα σοῦ πατρὸς μὲν ὃς προὔφθι πατὴρ
 τὰρχαῖον ὄντα Πέλοπα βάρβαρον Φρύγα;
 Ἀτρέα δ', ὃς αὖ σ' ἔσπειρε, δυσσεβέστατον
 προθέντ' ἀδελφῶ δεῖπνον οἰκείων τέκνων;
 αὐτὸς δὲ μητρὸς ἐξέφυς Κρήσεως, ἐφ' ἧ 1295

1269 Αἶας] Αἶαν O **1270** δορί] δόρει Dindorf **1271** πάντα ταῦτ'] ταῦτα πάντ' D **1272** κἀνόητ' LKAZr: κἀνόητ' AXrXs **1274** ἐντὸς XrXs^{gl}, Markland: οὔτος LKa ἐγκεκλημένους Elmsley: -λειμ- L: -λεισμ- Ka **1277** <θ>· Bothe **1281** οὗ σὺ μή, βῆναι Krauss: οὐδὲ συμβῆναι ω **1282** ὕμιν Schaefer: ὕμιν ω **1283** αὐτὸς] αὐ- Xs, Wolff **1284** λαχὼν] ἐκὼν Reiske ἦλθεν ἀντίος K^a: ἦλθ' ἐναντίος LK^x **1285** ἐς ωSi: εἰς QRNO **1290** ποῖ] ποῦ Xr^{rs} ποτ' αὐτὰ {L^{ac}Λ}Ka: ποτ' αὐτὸς L^{pc}A: σὺ ταῦτα Reiske **1292** τὰρχαῖον Campbell: ἀρχαῖον ω **1295** αὐτὸς] αὐτίς L^{yp}

- λαβὼν ἐπακτὸν ἄνδρ' ὃ φητύσας πατήρ
ἐφῆκεν ἔλλοις ἰχθύσιν διαφθοράν.
τοιοῦτος ὢν τοιῷδ' ὀνειδίζεις σποράν;
ὃς ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν εἰμι Τελαμῶνος γεγώς,
ὅστις στρατοῦ τὰ πρῶτ' ἀριστεύσας ἐμὴν 1300
ἴσχει ξύνευνον μητέρ', ἣ φύσει μὲν ἦν
βασίλεια, Λαομέδοντος· ἔκκριτον δέ νιν
δώρημ' ἐκείνῳ δῶκεν Ἀλκμήνης γόνος.
ἄρ' ὦδ' ἀριστεὺς ἐξ ἀριστέοιν δυοῖν
βλαστῶν ἂν αἰσχύνοιμι τοὺς πρὸς αἵματος, 1305
οὓς νῦν σὺ τοιοῖσδ' ἐν πόνοισι κειμένους
ὠθεῖς ἀθάπτους, οὐδ' ἐπαισχύνῃ λέγων;
εὖ νυν τόδ' ἴσθι, τοῦτον εἰ βαλεῖτέ που,
βαλεῖτε χῆμας τρεῖς ὁμοῦ συγκειμένους.
ἐπεὶ καλὸν μοι τοῦδ' ὑπερπονουμένῳ 1310
θανεῖν προδήλως μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς σῆς ὑπὲρ
γυναικός, ἢ τοῦ σοῦ γ' ὁμαίμονος λέγων;
πρὸς ταῦθ' ὅρα μὴ τοῦμόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σόν.
ὥς εἴ με πημανεῖς τι, βουλήσῃ ποτὲ
καὶ δειλὸς εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ ἔμοι θρασύς. 1315
- Χο. ἄναξ Ὀδυσσεῦ, καιρὸν ἴσθ' ἐληλυθώς,
εἰ μὴ ξυνάψων, ἀλλὰ συλλύσων πάρει.
- Οδ. τί δ' ἔστιν, ἄνδρες; τηλόθεν γὰρ ἡσθόμην
βοῇν Ἀτρείδων τῷδ' ἐπ' ἀλκίμῳ νεκρῷ.
- Αγ. οὐ γὰρ κλυόντες ἔσμεν αἰσχίστους λόγους, 1320
ἄναξ Ὀδυσσεῦ, τοῦδ' ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς ἀρτίως;
Οδ. ποίους; ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ συγγνώμην ἔχω
κλυόντι φλαῦρα συμβαλεῖν ἔπη κακά.

1296 φητύσας Zr, Pierson: φητεύσας ωΛ πατήρ] σ' Ἀτρεὺς Hermann: σ' ἀνὴρ Wolff **1303** δώρημ' ἐκείνῳ Brunck: δώρημα κείνῳ ω δῶκεν J, Heath: δῶκεν ω γόνος] τόκος C^{ac}V **1304** ἀριστεὺς Porson: ἀρισ-
τος ωSi ἀριστέοιν ωSi: -έων L^{ac} **1307** λέγων] γελῶν Burges: ψέγων
Erfurd **1308** νυν Turnebus: νῦν ω που] ποι Brunck **1309** συγ-
κειμένους ωΛ: συνεμπόρους L^{yp}K^{yp} **1310** ὑπερπονουμένῳ ωSi: -ους
L^{yp} **1312** γ' Bothe: θ' ωΛ **1315** ἔ] om. K: ἔπ' O², Tyrwhitt: γ' PV
1320-1 Agamemnoni trib. Ka, Teucro L, nuntio CH **1320** κλυόντες
West: κλύοντες ω **1323** κλυόντι West: κλύοντι ω

- Αγ. ἤκουσεν αἰσχροῖ· δρῶν γὰρ ἦν τοιαῦτ' ἐμέ.
 Οδ. τί γάρ σ' ἔδρασεν ὥστε καὶ βλάβην ἔχειν; 1325
 Αγ. οὐ φησ' ἔασιν τόνδε τὸν νεκρὸν ταφῆς
 ἄμοιρον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς βίαν θάψειν ἐμοῦ.
 Οδ. ἔξεστιν οὖν εἰπόντι τάληθ' ἰφίλω
 σοὶ μηδὲν ἦσσον ἢ πάρος ξυνηρετεῖν;
 Αγ. εἶπ' ἡ γὰρ εἶην οὐκ ἂν εὖ φρονῶν, ἐπεὶ 1330
 φίλον σ' ἐγὼ μέγιστον Ἀργείων νέμω.
 Οδ. ἄκουέ νυν. τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδε πρὸς θεῶν
 μὴ τλῆς ἄθαπτον ὧδ' ἀναλγήτως βαλεῖν·
 μηδ' ἡ βία σε μηδαμῶς νικησάτω
 τοσόνδε μισεῖν ὥστε τὴν δίκην πατεῖν. 1335
 καὶ μοὶ γὰρ ἦν ποθ' οὗτος ἔχθιστος στρατοῦ,
 ἐξ οὗ κῆρα τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὄπλων·
 ἀλλ' αὐτὸν ἔμπας ὄντ' ἐγὼ τοιόνδ' ἐμοὶ
 οὐ τὰν ἀτιμάσαιμ' ἄν, ὥστε μὴ λέγειν
 ἐν' ἄνδρ' ἰδεῖν ἄριστον Ἀργείων, ὅσοι 1340
 Τροίαν ἀφικόμεσθα, πλὴν Ἀχιλλέως.
 ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν ἐνδίκως γ' ἀτιμάζοιτο σοί·
 οὐ γάρ τι τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεῶν νόμους
 φθείροις ἄν. ἄνδρα δ' οὐ δίκαιον, εἰ θάνοι,
 βλάπτειν τὸν ἐσθλόν, οὐδ' ἐὰν μισῶν κυρῆς. 1345
 Αγ. σὺ ταῦτ', Ὀδυσσεῦ, τοῦδ' ὑπερμαχεῖς ἐμοί;
 Οδ. ἔγωγ' ἐμίσουν δ', ἡνίκ' ἦν μισεῖν καλόν.
 Αγ. οὐ γὰρ θανόντι καὶ προσεμβῆναί σε χρή;
 Οδ. μὴ χαῖρ', Ἀτρεΐδη, κέρδεσιν τοῖς μὴ καλοῖς.
 Αγ. τὸν τοι τύραννον εὐσεβεῖν οὐ ῥόδιον. 1350
 Οδ. ἀλλ' εὖ λέγουσι τοῖς φίλοις τιμὰς νέμειν.

1324 Agamemnoni trib. KDZr; Teucro LAXrXs ἐμέ Paley: με ὡ **1329**
 ξυνηρετεῖν Lobeck: —τμεῖν ὡ **1330** εἶπ' ἡ γὰρ Ka: ἐπεὶ γ' ἂν L²: ἡπεὶ
 γ' ἂν Λ **1332** νυν Turnebus: νῦν ὡ **1336** ἔχθιστος] οὐχθιστος Lloyd-
 Jones et Wilson **1337** κῆρα Q^{2pc}FO², Bentley: κράτησα ὡ **1338**
 ἔμπας L^{pc}AKa: —ης D^{gl}Xr^{gl}: —α L^{ac2} **1339** οὐ τὰν Elmsley: οὐκ ἂν 1:
 οὐκουν a οὐκ ἀντατιμήσαιμ' Bothe **1342** γ] om. KD σοὶ scripsi:
 σοι ὡ **1344** θάνοι] —η Wunder **1348** σε ὡEu: με Van Leeuwen

- Αγ. κλύειν τὸν ἐσθλὸν ἄνδρα χρή τῶν ἐν τέλει.
 Οδ. παῦσαι· κρατεῖς τοι τῶν φίλων νικώμενος.
 Αγ. μέμνησ' ὁποῖω φωτὶ τήν χάριν δίδως.
 Οδ. ὃδ' ἐχθρὸς ἀνὴρ, ἀλλὰ γενναῖός ποτ' ἦν. 1355
 Αγ. τί ποτε ποιήσεις; ἐχθρὸν ὧδ' αἰδῆ νέκυν;
 Οδ. νικᾷ γὰρ ἀρετὴ με τῆς ἐχθρας πολὺ.
 Αγ. τοιοῖδε μέντοι φῶτες ἐμπληκτοὶ βροτῶν.
 Οδ. ἡ κάρτα πολλοὶ νῦν φίλοι καυθῖσι πικροί.
 Αγ. τοιούσδ' ἐπαινεῖς δῆτα σὺ κτᾶσθαι φίλους; 1360
 Οδ. σκληρὰν ἐπαινεῖν οὐ φιλῶ ψυχὴν ἐγώ.
 Αγ. ἡμᾶς σὺ δειλοὺς τῇδε θῆμέρα φανεῖς.
 Οδ. ἄνδρας μὲν οὖν Ἑλλησι πᾶσιν ἐνδίκους.
 Αγ. ἄνωγας οὖν με τὸν νεκρὸν θάπτειν ἔαν;
 Οδ. ἔγωγε· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐνθάδ' ἵξομαι. 1365
 Αγ. ἡ πάνθ' ὅμοια· πᾶς ἀνὴρ αὐτῷ πονεῖ.
 Οδ. τῷ γὰρ με μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἢ ἡμαυτῷ πονεῖν;
 Αγ. σὸν ἄρα τοῦργον, οὐκ ἐμὸν κεκλήσεται.
 Οδ. ὧδ' ἦν ποιήσης, πανταχῇ χρηστός γ' ἔσῃ.
 Αγ. ἀλλ' εὖ γε μέντοι τοῦτ' ἐπίστασ', ὥς ἐγὼ 1370
 σοὶ μὲν νέμοιμ' ἂν τῆσδε καὶ μείζω χάριν.
 οὗτος δὲ κάκει' ἀνθάδ' ὦν ἔμοιγ' ὁμῶς
 ἔχθιστος ἔσται. σοὶ δὲ δρᾶν ἔξεσθ' ἃ χρῆς.
 Χο. ὅστις σ', Ὀδυσσεῦ, μὴ λέγει γινώμη σοφὸν
 φῦναι, τοιοῦτον ὄντα, μῶρός ἐστ' ἀνὴρ. 1375

1352 κλύειν post χρή *Eu* et Σ rec. Hom. II. **1353** παῦσαι] πιθοῦ Nauck: πάρες Postgate: πάσαις Markland νικώμενος *ωEu*: ἡσώμενος Aristides
1355 ἀνὴρ Erfurdt: ἀν— ω **1356** ποιήσεις] ποήσεις K **1357** νικᾷ
ωEu: κινεῖ Pearson με *ωEu*: τὸ Dawe: τὰ Wolff πολὺ *ωStEu*: πλέον
 C, gl. alibi **1358** ἐμπληκτοὶ *ωSu*: οὐμπληκτοὶ Blaydes βροτῶν *IX^r Su*:
 —οῖς a **1360** δῆτα Ka: δὴ LA **1366** sic interp. Byz αὐτῷ a: αὐ—
 L^r KD πονεῖ] φρονεῖ rO **1367** πονεῖν] φρονεῖν L^{rs} K^{1s} **1368** σὸν]
 σὸν γ' Porson: σοῦ γ' C: σὸν γὰρ Zr **1369** ὧδ' Polle: ὥς Ka [L^{ac}] ἦν
 Broadhead: ἂν ω ποιήσης Ka ποήσης L^{pc}: ποιήσεις {L^{ac}}A πανταχῇ
 LKXs^{pc} Zr: —χοῦ AXr, fort. Xs^{ac} γ' a: om. LK **1371** τῆσδε] τήνδε C,
 Bothe **1372** ὁμῶς a: ὁμως LKXr^{yp} **1373** χρῆς Dindorf: χρή ω

- Οδ. καὶ νῦν γε Τεύκρῳ τὰπὸ τοῦδ' ἀγγέλλομαι,
ὅσον τότε ἔχθρὸς ἦ, τοσόνδ' εἶναι φίλος.
καὶ τὸν θανόντα τόνδε συνθάπτειν θέλω,
καὶ ξυμπονεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ἐλλείπειν ὅσων
χρὴ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἀνδράσιν πορεῖν βροτούς. 1380
- Τευ. ἄριστ' Ὀδυσσεῦ, πάντ' ἔχω σ' ἐπαινέσαι
λόγοισι· καὶ μ' ἔψευσας ἐλπίδος πολὺ.
τούτῳ γὰρ ὦν ἔχθιστος Ἀργείων ἀνὴρ
μόνος παρέστης χερσίν, οὐδ' ἔτλης παρῶν
θανόντι τῷδε ζῶν ἐφυβρίσαι μέγα, 1385
ὥς ὁ στρατηγὸς οὐπιβρόντητος μολῶν
αὐτός τε χῶ ξύναιμος ἠθελήσάτην
[λωβητὸν αὐτὸν ἐκβαλεῖν ταφῆς ἄτερ].
τοιγάρ σφ' Ὀλύμπου τοῦδ' ὁ πρεσβεύων πατήρ
μνήμων τ' Ἑρινὺς καὶ τελεσφόρος Δίκη 1390
κακοὺς κακῶς φθείρειαν, ὥσπερ ἠθελον
τὸν ἄνδρα λῶβαις ἐκβαλεῖν ἀναξίως.
σὲ δ', ὦ γεραίου σπέρμα Λαέρτου πατρός,
τάφου μὲν ὀκνῶ τοῦδ' ἐπιψαύειν ἔαν,
μὴ τῷ θανόντι τοῦτο δυσχερὲς ποιῶ· 1395
τὰ δ' ἄλλα καὶ ζύμπρασσε, κεῖ τινα στρατοῦ
θέλεις κομίζειν, οὐδὲν ἄλγος ἔξομεν.
ἐγὼ δὲ τᾶλλα πάντα πορσυνῶ· σὺ δὲ
ἀνὴρ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐσθλὸς ὦν ἐπίστασο.
- Οδ. ἀλλ' ἠθελον μέν· εἰ δὲ μή στί σοι φίλον 1400
πράσσειν τάδ' ἡμᾶς, εἴμ' ἐπαινέσας τὸ σόν.
- Τευ. ἄλις· ἦδη γὰρ πολὺς ἐκτέταται
χρόνος. ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν κοίλην κάπετον

1377 ἦ Elmsley: ἦν ὦ φίλος **a**: —ον L^{ac}K^{ac} **1379** ὅσων Δ^sZc^{1s}, Porson: ὅσῳ L^{2s}: ὅσον ὦ **1380** πορεῖν Housman: πονεῖν ὦ **[1388]** del. Nauck **1390** Ἑρινὺς LK: —νν— **a** **1392** τὸν τόνδ' Bentley **1393** Λαέρτου LK**a**: Λαρτίου Xr **1395** ποιῶ {L^{ac}}**a**: ποῶ L^{pc}K **1396** ζύμπρασσε Brunck: ζύμπραττε ὦ **1398** τᾶλλα] τάμᾳ Rauchenstein **1402–20** habent ὦSi: del. Dawe (iam **1402–13** ἄλις . . . μένος Nauck, **1416** Bentley, **1417** Dindorf, **1418–20** Ritter)

χερσὶ ταχύνετε, τοὶ δ' ὑψίβατον
 τρίποδ' ἀμφίπυρον λουτρῶν ὁσίων 1405
 θέσθ' ἐπικάιρον·

μία δ' ἐκ κλισίας ἀνδρῶν ἴλη
 τὸν ὑπασπίδιον κόσμον φερέτω.
 παῖ, σὺ δὲ πατρός γ', ὅσον ἰσχύεις,
 φιλότῃτι θιγῶν πλευράς σὺν ἐμοὶ 1410
 τάσδ' ἐπικούφιζ'. ἔτι γὰρ θερμαὶ

σύριγγες ἄνω φυσῶσι μέλαν
 μένος. ἀλλ' ἄγε πᾶς, φίλος ὅστις ἀνὴρ
 φησὶ παρεῖναι, σούσθω, βάτω,
 τῷδ' ἀνδρὶ πονῶν τῷ πάντ' ἀγαθῷ 1415
 <∞ — ∞ — ∞ — ∞ >

[κούδενί πω λῶνι θνητῶν
 Αἴαντος, ὅτ' ἦν, τότε φωνῶ.]

Χο. ἦ πολλὰ βροτοῖς ἔστιν ἰδοῦσιν
 γνῶναι· πρὶν ἰδεῖν δ' οὐδείς μάντις
 τῶν μελλόντων ὅ τι πράξει. 1420

1404 ταχύνετε LK^a: —ατε Zr τοὶ ὠSu: τὸν Su **1409** γ' ὅσον] τόσον
 Wecklein post **1415** lacunam posui [**1417**] τότε] τόδε Jaeger **1419**
 ἰδεῖν δ' La: δ' ἰδεῖν AK

COMMENTARY

COMMENTARY

ΑΙΑΣ: Dindorf (1825 edn) restored this title in place of manuscript Αἴας Μαστιγοφόρος. The hypothesis (printed in Pearson's edition) states that the Διδασκαλῖαι (a list of plays performed at Athens compiled by Aristotle) designate it simply as Αἴας (Arist. fr. 623 Rose). According to the same source, Dicaearchus (a pupil of Aristotle, who wrote hypotheses to S.'s plays) called the play Αἴαντος θάνατος (fr. 79 Wehrli). The hypothesis attributes the epithet Μαστιγοφόρος to Ajax's whipping of the ram which he believes to be Odysseus, or to a desire to distinguish the drama from S.'s play Αἴας Λοκρός.

The latter reason is correct. The same occurs with other homonymous pairs by the same author, such as Sophocles' *Oedipus* dramas (later distinguished as Τύραννος and Κολωνεύς) and Euripides' *Hippolytus* (Στεφανηφόρος and Καλυπτόμενος) and *Iphigenia* plays (ἡ ἐν Ταύροις and ἡ ἐν Αὐλίδι). But the scholiast's explanation needs refinement. West (1979a) 131 = M. Lloyd (2007) 361–2 points to the visual emphasis of our title and the titles of the *Hippolytus* plays: 'such names will not have originated with scholars who knew the plays mainly from reading but with people who knew them as spectacles'. He ascribes them to the book trade; someone buying or selling a copy of a play with a homonymous counterpart by the same author needed a means of specifying which drama was meant. They would have come into existence in the late fifth and fourth centuries, but only informally and sporadically; Aristotle, for example, refers simply to *Oedipus* and *Iphigenia* in the *Poetics* without further specification (Sommerstein (2002a) 4 = (2010a) 14). The play which we know as S.'s *Philoctetes* probably acquired a sur-title, now lost, to distinguish it from Φιλοκτῆτης ἐν Τροίᾳ (Sommerstein (2002a) 3–4 n. 10 = (2010a) 14 n. 10; perhaps ἐν Λήμνῳ?).

PROLOGUE (1–133)

1–133 *Ajax* is one of six surviving Sophoclean tragedies which begin with a dialogue. Uniquely among the extant prologues, one of the speakers is a god, whose interactions with the humans (who themselves do not interact) reveal aspects of their respective characters, as well as the setting of the play. Odysseus treats Athena with friendly deference (14–35n.), Ajax with misguided enthusiasm mixed with defiance (89–117n.). She toys with both men, gently with Odysseus (36–7n., Johnson and Clapp (2005) 126), cruelly with Ajax (51–73n., M. Heath (1987) 170 n. 11). In fr. 10c *TrGF* (*Locrian Ajax*) Athena rages at the protagonist's wrongdoing. In our play she is less openly outraged, but her animus is no less potent and menacing; she revels in her superiority and

his blindness. For other epiphanies of Athena in tragedy see Papadopoulou (2001) 297–309; for other divinities on the Sophoclean stage see R. Parker (1999) 11–12 with nn. 1–2 (Heracles in *Phil.*, Demeter in *Triptolemus*, Thetis in *Syndeipnoi*, Athena in *Locrian Ajax*, Apollo and Artemis in *Niobe*).

Evidence for divinities in other prologues is limited to five Euripidean plays, all probably later than *Ajax* (*Alcestis*: Apollo, *Hippolytus*: Aphrodite, *Troades*: Poseidon and Athena, *Ion*: Hermes, *Bacchae*: Dionysus). Such figures not only describe the situation, but also predict part of the action (in *Alcestis* this element comes at 64–71, after Apollo’s dialogue with Death). The prologue of *Ajax* fights shy of such revelations. Emphasis falls on what has happened during the past night, and the extent of Ajax’s involvement; naturally enough, since Odysseus has arrived to pursue such an inquiry. But while Athena assists Odysseus’ investigation, she does not recommend action beyond communicating his discovery (66–7) and avoiding arrogance (127–30). Nor does she make an explicit prediction. Euripides’ Aphrodite may foretell the deaths of Hippolytus and Phaedra (*Hipp.* 21–2, 43–8), but S.’s Athena is altogether more inscrutable. Her gnomic remark about the power of a day in human affairs will prove significant and predictive (131–2n.), but the audience do not know that yet. This aspect of the prologue is aimed at specific dramatic effects. S. establishes the gravity of Ajax’s crime in order to motivate the action, but avoids making the obvious consequences of that crime seem inevitable. As a result, Ajax’s decision to kill himself is a real choice with tragic significance, which it would lose if a prophecy from Athena had already certified his doom. The chorus’s later predictions of death (227/8–232, 253/4–256), by contrast, emphasise the seriousness of the situation, but are not determinative; and even the chorus stop anticipating their fate once Ajax appears.

Afflicting Ajax with madness on his first appearance is a bold stroke. Elsewhere in tragedy characters so affected have already been seen by the audience in their normal mental state (e.g. Heracles and Orestes in Euripides’ eponymous plays; Pentheus in *Bacchae*). Eschewing this contrast makes the prologue especially shocking (thus MD); yet S. allows room for intensification, by stressing how Ajax’s return to sanity plunges him into deeper grief and degradation (263–81, 305–26). (Reinhardt (1947) 20–2 = (1979) 11–13 compares Aeschylus’ *Niobe*, another drama where the protagonist experiences divine vengeance before the start; but in our play the gods are not finished with Ajax yet.) Ajax’s madness is unusually free of the physical symptoms of insanity (Harries (1891) 18–19; contrast *Iliu Persis* fr. 2.7–8 *GEF*, Eur. *Her.* 922–1015), and his speech is frank, almost cheerful. The normality accentuates the horror: ‘it is the terrible calmness and assurance of his behaviour that make it so terrifying’ (MD).

Hunting imagery further marks Ajax’s humiliation. His attack on the camp is a kind of hunt, which results in his bringing ‘spoil’ (ῥγρᾱ, 64, 93) back to

his hut. But as he nears his goal he himself is cast into metaphorical ‘nets of disaster’ (ἐρεκη κακὰ, 60), and becomes the target of a hunt, silently acted out by Odysseus before the first words of the play. But while hunter and hunted may have switched places, the attitudes of the two characters involved scarcely fit their new roles. Ajax in his madness joyfully celebrates his non-existent triumph; Odysseus, who has achieved his aim and seen his enemy humiliated, looks on him with pitying melancholy rather than delight (121–6n.). This thoughtful and unexpected reaction, highlighted by the contrasting divine triumphalism of Athena, will be balanced by his equally unexpected intervention in the closing scene of the play; in the meantime, the audience will see Ajax’s party repeatedly traduce his character.

Odysseus furtively enters from eisodos A and begins to move round the skene, keeping his distance. Athena enters from the same eisodos (thus Schneidewin¹ p. 8 with n. *, Ziobro (1972) 122–7, Fitzpatrick (2000) 140–3), beginning to speak when she appears on stage. Although visible to the audience, Athena cannot be seen by Odysseus (cf. 15 ἄποπτος), who recognises her by her voice (14–17n.). The audience will assume that Ajax, too, cannot see her; she could hardly give precedence to Ajax by allowing only him to see her. (Contrast Hom. *Il.* 1.198, where Athena is visible only to Achilles: a mark of special favour.) The audience later learns that Athena was invisible to Tecmessa as well; she states that Ajax spoke ‘to some shadow’ (301), which suggests that his interlocutor was not merely out of her line of vision.

The scene would function just as well if Athena was visible to the characters; and in all three tragedians gods interact with mortals without visual impediment. But her invisibility is appropriate in a scene where the gap between mortal and immortal vision looms large. Athena earlier threw Ajax’s mission into confusion by distorting his vision (51–2); she now does the same to prevent him from seeing Odysseus (69–70, 85); she emphasises her ability to show Odysseus what he has long been looking for (66–7); ironically, Odysseus admits that men (not gods) are mere insubstantial shadows (125–6; Pucci (1994) 21–2). Visibility also marks the hierarchy of the trio: Athena can see both Odysseus and Ajax; Odysseus can see Ajax but not Athena; Ajax sees neither. ‘As Athene is to Odysseus, so Odysseus is to Ajax: superior, and sighted’ (Buxton (1980) 23).

Other views on the staging, and the visibility of the characters, are as follows:

(i) Athena is unseen, or obscure, to Odysseus because she is at a distance from him (Stanford, Pucci (1994) 22 with n. 16; for ἄποπτος ‘barely seen at a distance’ see Jebb’s appendix on *OR* 762), or at first concealed in a grove (Pickard-Cambridge (1946) 48, H/OK (2007) 364). But why should such a trivial detail receive such emphasis? ἄποπτος is weak and irrelevant unless it means ‘invisible’.

(ii) Athena is invisible to Odysseus at the beginning, but in time the audience forgets this (Garvie). The emphasis throughout on vision and blindness makes this unlikely.

(iii) Athena does not appear on stage, but is represented by a loud voice from behind the skene (thus Paley, 1880 edn, on 15). Even assuming that this was practical for such a long period in the ancient theatre, a disembodied Athena would be ‘inconvenient and pointless’ (Taplin (1977) 366 n. 1; cf. Calder (1965) 116 n. 2 = (2005) 67 n. 2).

(iv) Athena appears on top of the θεολογεῖον, a platform at the top of the skene (Schneidewin² p. 9 n. *, Jebb, Calder (1965) = (2005) 67–71 and (1974), Mastronarde (1990) 278), or on the μηχανή, a crane used for aerial appearances (Brunck). Odysseus is at first unable to see her because his attention is fixed on the skene. Again, this renders ἀποπτος weak and irrelevant, and Odysseus somewhat obtuse; why not just look up? (His huntsman’s caution in approaching the skene means that she would be easily within his line of vision.) See further M. Heath (1987) 166 n. 3, which demolishes Calder’s case in favour of putting Athena on high. In dramatic terms, an Athena at ground level ‘allows a more effective visual representation of Athene’s control of the space (e.g. her protection of Odysseus could be enacted by her interposing herself physically between him and Ajax)’ (H/OK (2007) 364).

(v) Athena starts on top, then climbs down before 34–5 (Blume (2004a) 114). To the problems of (iv) this adds the inconvenience of getting the actor from the top to the bottom of the skene.

1–13 In a few deft strokes S. establishes the identity of characters on and off stage, the location (cf. Kuntz (1993) 18 n. 5), and the proximate cause of the action. Athena expresses her closeness to Odysseus; she compliments his successful search, and volunteers some of the information which he seeks. The style appears deliberately low-key. Eschewing self-assertion for the moment, Athena invites Odysseus to tell her what is going on. But she knows more than she is saying, as the audience might have guessed, and as she herself suggests (13).

Hunting imagery (2 θηρώμενον, 5 κυνηγετοῦντα, 6 ἵχνη . . . νεοχάραχθ’) culminates in the dog simile of 7–8; such terminology remains important through the prologue (e.g. 31–3n., 92–3n.).

1–2 Αἰεὶ μὲν, ὦ παῖ Λαρτίου, δέδορκα σε | πείραν τιν’ ἐχθρῶν ἀρπάσαι θηρώμενον: ‘Son of Laertes, I have always seen you hunting to seize some opportunity against your enemies.’ Athena’s words, true as far as they go, do not do justice to the complexity of Odysseus’ attitude to his foes (121–6n.). ‘The goddess is presenting from her point of view the sequence traced by mortals in prayers of the type “you have always helped me in the past . . . do

so now too” (MD, citing Odysseus to Athena at Hom. *Il.* 10.278–80, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.32.1). Prominent αἶ points to Odysseus’ continual scheming (cf. Hom. *Od.* 13.293–5, 330–2) and Athena’s consistent support (cf. *Phil.* 134 Νίκη . . . Ἀθάνᾳ Πολιάς, ἥ σῶζει μ’ αἶ, Hom. *Il.* 23.782–3, *Od.* 13.300–1, 20.47–8). θηρώμενον governs ἀρπάζσαι, which in turn governs πείραν (cf. Plut. *Philop.* 15.4 ἀρπάζσας τὸν καιρὸν). The alternative, θηρώμενον governing πείραν, with ἀρπάζσαι as an exegetical infinitive (‘hunting for an opportunity, to seize it’), appears needlessly complicated.

μέν opens speeches in verse and prose, but its function is unclear; see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1, Denniston 382–3. The play presents the following versions of Laertes’ name, all in the genitive: Λαρτίου (1, 380), Λαερτίου (101), Λαέρτου (1393). Homer uses only Λαέρτης; Euripides has all three. MDR suggests that the forms in –τι– are backformations from epic Λαερτιάδης, itself perhaps a dactylic substitute for Λαερτίδης.

3–4 καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ σκηναῖς σε ναυτικάς ὁρῶ | Αἴαντος ‘And now I see you at the marine encampment of Ajax’. The general claim of 1–2 yields to a statement specific to the present: cf. *Tl.* 49–52 πολλὰ μὲν σ’ ἐγὼ | κατεῖδον ἤδη . . . | . . . | νῦν δ’ . . . with Davies, Maehler on Bacchyl. 11.10, Arnott’s commentary on Alexis, p. 725 n. 1. καί takes up μὲν (Denniston 374). The translation of σκηναῖς . . . ναυτικάς is owed to Scullion (1994) 123 n. 129, who for the plural in a military context compares e.g. Hom. *Il.* 11.7 (cited next n.), Aesch. *Eum.* 685–6, Eur. *Hec.* 1288–9. σκηνή or σκηναί is the regular Attic word, whereas Homer uses κλισίη. I refer to Ajax’s ‘hut’, not ‘tent’: it has a door (11) that can be barred (579) and pillars (108) (cf. A. Brown (1984) 10).

4 ἔνθα τάξιν ἐσχάτην ἔχει ‘where he holds the extreme position’. For Ajax’s station at one edge of the camp cf. Hom. *Il.* 11.7–9 (Eris shouts) ἡμὲν ἐπ’ Αἴαντος κλισίας Τελαμωνιάδαο | ἡδ’ ἐπ’ Ἀχιλλῆος, τοί ῥ’ ἐσχάτα νῆας ἔϊσας | εἴρυσαν, ἡγορήῃ πύσνοιο καὶ κάρτεϊ χειρῶν, [10.113] (Nestor encourages Agamemnon to summon Ajax and Idomeneus) τῶν γὰρ νῆες ἕασιν ἐκαστάτω, οὐδὲ μάλ’ ἐγγύς, Eur. *Id.* 288–93 Αἴας δ’ ὁ Σαλαμῖνος ἔντροφος . . . ἐσχάταισι συμπλέκων | δώδεκ’ εὐστροφωτάταισι ναυσίν. The isolation of the setting matches the protagonist’s mental and social isolation: cf. the programmatic exposition of Lemnos as a deserted island at *Phil.* 1–2 (contrary to previous tradition: cf. Finglass (2006a) 219 with n. 16), which similarly corresponds to the ἦθος of the main character. See also 29–31n. on μόνος.

5–7 πάλαι κυνηγετοῦντα καὶ μετρούμενον | ἴχνη τὰ κείνου νεοχάραχθ’, ὅπως ἴδης | εἴτ’ ἔνδον εἴτ’ οὐκ ἔνδον. ‘on the trail for some time and measuring his freshly-printed footprints, to see whether or not he is inside.’ κυνηγετοῦντα leads into the comparison in 7–8 (cf. Zagagi (1999) 190 n. 30, Lilja

(1976) 61). For μετρέω, μετρέομαι of ocular measurement cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 180–1 ἐκείνος (Capaneus) προσβάσεις τεκμαίρεται | πύργων, ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω τείχη μετρῶν.

7–8 εὖ δέ σ' ἐκφέρει | κυνὸς Λακαίνης ὥς τις εὐρινὸς βάσις. 'Well does your course bring you to your goal, like that of a keen-scented Laconian dog.' 'Laconian dogs are hunting dogs, proverbial for speed and keenness of scent' (Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 5.8 (p. 238), with references). For the stress on the dog's sense of smell cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1093–4 ἔοικεν εὐρις ἡ ξένη κυνὸς δίκην | εἶναι, where Fraenkel compares Xen. *Cyn.* 4.6, Pollux 5.60 (1 278.3 Bethe). For ἐκφέρω cf. Pl. *Phaedo* 66b κινδυνεύει τοι ὥσπερ ἄτραπὸς τις ἐκφέρειν ἡμᾶς; also the related, intransitive sense 'come to fulfilment' (cf. Davies on *Ti.* 824 and *OC* 1424, where read ἐκφέρει).

I take εὐρινος as a genitive, from εὐρις (thus Wesseling (1751) 4, Sommer (1948) 88–90). Others interpret it as a nominative (thus [Liban.] *Descr.* 10.3 = viii 488.2–4 Foerster, *Suda* ε 3689 = ii 467.26 Adler εὐρινος: εὐρόσφρητος, citing part of line 8), applying the adjective to another noun by enallage, with 'keen-scented course of a dog' standing for 'course of a keen-scented dog'. But while enallage is found in tragedy (Åzelius (1897) 21–2 and Bers (1974) 58–65 cite Sophoclean examples), we do not expect it everywhere; it is not enough to cite two parallels from anapaests and lyric, as Jebb does (Eur. *Her.* 449–50, *Phoen.* 1351). Athena's straightforward style (1–13n.; contrast 51–73n.) makes it the less enticing option. (Cf. the rejection by Diggle (2007) 150 of Housman's emendation of Eur. *IT* 15: 'an epithet which is so boldly picturesque in Aeschylus' lyrics stands out, like a patch of purple, in the penny-plain verses of this iambic prologue'.) Word order also tells against a connexion between εὐρινος and βάσις (thus Wesseling (1751) 4): on hearing κυνὸς swiftly followed by εὐρινος, the audience would probably take them together, and only retreat from this assumption if the rest of the sentence made that impossible. Nor should we expect adjectives to be shared equally among available nouns (134–5n.); κυνὸς Λακαίνης makes up a single unit in any case (Fraenkel (1977) 3).

εὐρις occurs at Aesch. *Ag.* 1093 (quoted above; cf. S. fr. 29.2 *TiGF* κελαινόρινες), whereas εὐρινος is not attested until Babrius (2nd c. AD or earlier). Such pairs of adjectives are found in the classical period, however, as the following list shows (earliest attestations in brackets): εὐθριξ (Homer), εὐτριχος (Euripides); εὐζυς (Dioscorides), εὐζυγος (Homer); σύζυς (Euripides), σύζυγος (Aeschylus). If we can generalise from velar to nasal stems, εὐρις and εὐρινος might therefore coexist in S.'s day.

9–10 ἐνδον γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἄρτι τυγχάνει, κάρα | στάζων ἰδρῶτι καὶ χέρας ξιφοκτόνους. 'For the man is now inside, dripping with sweat from his head and hands which kill with the sword.' The vivid picture (cf. Aesch. *Eum.*

41–2 αἵματι | σταζόντα χεῖρας) ‘arrests the audience’s attention and makes them eager for an explanation’ (MLW, pointing also to ἀνδρὶ δυσμενεῖ in 18). Sweat indicates recent activity, the violent nature of which is hinted at by ξιφοκτόνους; cf. the similarly pregnant adjective at *Il.* 24.478–9 κύσε χεῖρας | δεινὰς ἀνδροφόνους, αἱ οἱ πολέας κτάνον υἱας. This adjective also introduces the sword which will have such a significant part in the play.

ἀνὴρ is Brunck’s reinterpretation (in his first edition, written ὠνὴρ; Lobeck¹ corrects his orthography) of unmetrical ἀνὴρ in the manuscripts, which often omit the rough breathing arising from the contraction of a noun with its article (cf. Arnott on Alexis fr. 88.3–5 *PCG*).

11–13 καὶ σ’ οὐδὲν εἶσω τῆσδε παπταίνειν πύλης | ἔτ’ ἔργον ἐστίν, ἐννέπειν δ’ ὅτου χάριν | σπουδὴν ἔθου τήνδ’, ὡς παρ’ εἰδυίας μάθης. ‘And there is no more need for you to peer inside this door, but to say why you have made this effort, so that you may learn from one who knows.’ οὐδὲν ἔργον ‘characterizes an action as out of place’ (Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 911, with examples; cf. 852). παπταίνω is exclusively poetic in classical Greek (elsewhere in tragedy at *Ant.* 1231, [Aesch.] *PV* 334, 1034). For σπουδὴν τίθεσθαι cf. fr. 909.1 *TrGF* ὠνὴν ἔθου καὶ πράσιν, Pind. *P.* 4.276 θέμεν σπουδάν; for such periphrases used as equivalents for a finite verb cf. 520, 525, 536, 540, 1269, Long (1968) 84 n. 70, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 695.

14–35 Odysseus in turn emphasises his closeness to Athena, but the more formal beginning and ending underline his subordinate status. He first tells her that something happened during the night, perhaps caused by Ajax (21–4), before then specifying what that was, and the reason for connecting it with him (25–31). Throughout he stresses the uncertainty surrounding the crisis (22, 23, 32–3), as well as his own activity in response to it (18–20, 24, 31–2). Although he has taken the initiative, the situation remains baffling: thus Odysseus presents himself as someone in need of Athena’s help and worthy of receiving it. Among all this surmise and confusion, two vivid details stand out: the dead animals, and Ajax bounding over the plain.

14–17 Odysseus infers Athena’s presence from her voice, as at Hom. *Il.* 2.182 = [10.512] ὡς φάθ’, ὃ δὲ ξυνέηκε θεᾶς ὅπα φωνησάσης. Odysseus’ address at [Eur.] *Rhes.* 608–10 δέσποινα Ἀθάναι, φθέγγματος γὰρ ἡσθόμην | τοῦ σοῦ συνήθη γῆρυν· ἐν πόνουσι γὰρ | παρούσ’ ἀμύνεις τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἅει ποτε may be influenced by our speech. For other passages where ‘a mortal infers a god’s presence from . . . perceptible signs’ (apart from sight) see Fraenkel *q.v.* Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1391–3, adding Tr. Adesp. fr. 672a.4–5 *TrGF* (v/2 p. 1142) ὁδμή τις ἤμεν πιθάν’ ἔπνευσε θε[ᾶς] τ’ ἐμῇ[ς] | φωνὴ προσῆλθε προσφιλής. In the *Iliad* aural recognition of a divinity ‘suggests the mortal’s familiarity with the divine, and such familiarity exalts him’ (Turkeltaub (2007) 61).

14 ὦ φθέγγμ' Ἀθάνας 'O voice of Athena'. For 'voice' in the vocative (especially appropriate here as Odysseus cannot see the goddess: cf. Long (1968) 124) see *El.* 1225n. For the orthography of φθέγγμα see West's Teubner Aeschylus, p. lii; for the differing forms of the name Athena see Björck (1950) 133–5.

φιλότατης ἐμοὶ θεῶν 'dearest of the gods to me'. Cf. Beroutsos on *Men. Asp.* 289 φίλτατ' ἀνθρώπων ἐμοί: 'the genitive ἀνθρώπων heightens the emotion of the address, as does the addition of the dative, which is more typical of tragedy' (citing *El.* 1126, Aesch. *Cho.* 1051, Eur. *Hipp.* 1092, *Or.* 732–3). Odysseus' special relationship with Athena (38n., 92n.) allows him to use this vocative of the goddess (see Harder on Eur. fr. 448a.65 *TrGF*, p. 89); Hera uses the same phrase of her at Tr. Adesp. fr. 81.9 [sic] *TrGF*. For expressions involving φίλτατος and the genitive plural see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 602.

15–17 ὡς εὐμαθὲς σου, κἄν ἄποπτος ᾗς ὄμως, | φώνημ' ἀκούω καὶ ξυναρπάζω φρενὶ | χαλκοστόμου κώδωνος ὡς Τυρσηνικῆς. 'how easily, even though you are invisible, do I hear your voice and grasp it in my mind, like that of a bronze-mouthed Etruscan trumpet.' Instead of σου . . . ἄποπτος the scholia to Aeschines (1.23 = p. 15 Dilts) read μοι . . . ἄγνωστος; the unmetrical adjective presents an unclassical idea of divinity ('unknown', 'unknowable') familiar to scribes (cf. *Acts of the Apostles* 17.23).

For ὄμως inserted in a concessive clause cf. *OC* 957 καὶ δίκαι' ὄμως λέγω, Aesch. *Pers.* 295, Eur. *Alc.* 936, K–G II 280 (4), Fraenkel (1933) 324–5 n. 1 = (1964) I 98–9 n. 3, West on Hes. *Op.* 20; also ἔμπα(ς) at 563, 1338. Elmsley (1814) 351 first advocates this punctuation, in accordance with the tragic idiom; editors previously printed a comma before ὄμως, not after it. Both punctuations are found in the manuscripts (Dawe, *STS* II 3).

For ξυναρπάζω of acquiring news cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. συναρπάζω 3, adding Alexis fr. 37.8–9 *PCG*; also ἀρπαλίζω, –ομαι at Aesch. *Sept.* 242–3 ('seize on the news': Hutchinson), Archil. fr. 24.4 *IEG* (perhaps), Hesych. α 7399 (I 251 Latte) ἀρπαλίζομαι· ἀσμένως δέχομαι.

κώδων is properly 'bell' (Aesch. *Sept.* 386, Thuc. 4.135.1, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 308, Dem. 25.90); its feminine gender is not distinctively Attic (so correctly Renehan (2001) 235, comparing αὐλών; *pace* LSJ⁹ s.v.). For Athena's connexion with the trumpet cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.217–21 (a simile for Achilles' shout as accompanied by Athena), Ant. Sid. *A.P.* 6.46, 6.159 = 174–7, 178–81 *HE*, Tymnes *A.P.* 6.151 = 3600–3 *HE*, Archias *A.P.* 6.195 = 3646–9 *GP*, Serghidou (2001) 69–70 (on the sanctuary of Athena Salpinx at Argos). According to ΣΤ Hom. *Il.* 18.219 (iv 474–5.22–3, 33–4 Erbse), there were six types of trumpet: πρώτη ἡ Ἑλληνική, μακρὰ τὸ σχῆμα, ἦν Τυρρηνοῖς εὗρεν ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ . . . ἔκτη ἡ Τυρσηνική, ὁμοία Φρυγίῳ αὐλῷ, τὸν κώδωνα κεκλασμένον ἔχουσα· ἔστι δὲ λίαν ὀξύφωνος. For the ancient trumpet see further *El.* 711n., adding Olson on Ar. *Pax* 1240–1; for its Etruscan origin cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 567–8, Eur. *Hcll.* 830–1, Men. fr. 620

PCG, Hesych. λ 836 (π 592 Latte), Pollux 4.85 (π 226.4–5 Bethe), Phot. λ 284 (π 506 Theodoridis).

18–19 καὶ νῦν ἐπέγνως εὖ μ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ δυσμενεῖ | βάσιν κυκλοῦντ', Αἴαντι τῷ σακεσφόρῳ. 'And now you have well discovered that I am circling my steps towards a hostile man, Ajax the shieldbearer.' Odysseus' encirclement is the action of a spy or scout homing in on his quarry while avoiding confrontation; δυσμενεῖ (9–10n.) and σακεσφόρῳ convey the threat which Ajax represents. For βάσιν κυκλοῦντ' cf. Eur. *El.* 561 τί δὲ κυκλεῖ περίξ πόδα;., *Phoen.* 364 κυκλῶν πρόσωπον, *Or.* 632, Ar. *Av.* 1379 with Dunbar, Rau (1967) 156; also 42n.

On three occasions in the *Iliad* Ajax is described as φέρων σάκος ἥτε πύργον (7.219, 11.485, 17.128), the first of which presents a detailed account of the shield (7.219–23 φέρων σάκος ἥτε πύργον, | χάλκεον ἐπταβόειον, ὃ οἱ Τυχίος κάμε τεύχων, | σκυτοτόμων ὄχ' ἄριστος, ὕλη ἐνὶ οἰκίᾳ ναίων, | ὅς οἱ ἐποίησεν σάκος αἰόλον ἐπταβόειον | ταύρων ζατρεφών, ἐπὶ δ' ὄγδοον ἦλσσε χαλκόν). This huge tower-shield, which had not been in use for hundreds of years before Homer's time, is also presupposed at 13.709–11, where λαοὶ . . . ἔταροι take it from Ajax when he grows tired. It was attached to the body by a τελαμών or leather strap, and could be fastened backwards, as at 11.545 and (by implication) 14.404–6. But Ajax is said to carry it πρόσθε στέρνοιο (7.224), and Hector casts a rock which hits it μέσσον ἐπομφάλιον ('on the boss in the middle', 7.267), which implies the circular hand-held shield familiar in Homer's day (cf. Lorimer (1950) 182–4). Elsewhere S. appears to conflate the tower-shield with a contemporary form of armour (574–6n.).

σακεσφόρος is attested elsewhere at Bacchyl. 13.104 (of Ajax), Eur. *Phoen.* 139, and Pl. *Com.* fr. 130 *PCG*. For other military –φόρος compounds see Mülke (2007) 24 (on S. P.Oxy. 4807 col. ii.8 θωρακοφόροις).

20 κείνον γάρ, οὐδέν' ἄλλον, ἰχνεύω πάλαι. 'For it is he, no one else, whom I have long been tracking.'

21–2 νυκτὸς γάρ ἡμᾶς τῆσδε πρᾶγος ἄσκοπον | ἔχει περάνας, εἴπερ εἴργασται τάδε. 'For during this night he has accomplished an incomprehensible act against us, if indeed he has done these things.' Odysseus remains cautious: not until 39 does Athena confirm Ajax's culpability. τάδε, looking forward to the coming description of Ajax's acts, is superior to γ' ὅδε (*coni.* Musgrave) or τόδε (which would have looked backwards to πρᾶγος).

For the genitive of time cf. 285, 1143, *El.* 477n. For the double accusative see Moorhouse 37–8. ἄσκοπον indicates that 'the deed is such as no one would have expected beforehand' (De Jong (2006) 77 n. 12, comparing *El.* 1315 and *Phil.* 1111). Periphrastic ἔχει plus participle is common in S., but not limited to him (Aerts (1965) 128–60). πρᾶγος (in S. at 347, *OC* 1153, fr. 314.80 *TrGF*) is paratragic in comedy (Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 112) and absent from prose.

23 ἴσμεν γὰρ οὐδὲν τρανές, ἀλλ’ ἀλώμεθα· ‘For we know nothing clearly, but are at a loss.’ The variant ἴδμεν (*EM* p. 466.12 Gaisford) is probably a Homericism. τρανής is limited to tragedy in classical literature (see further de Roos (1976) 329–30). The adjective ‘may well have been formed with the secondary suffix –άνης which is also found in πρηνής, σαφηνής’ (Meissner (2006) 209). ἀλάσμαι of mental wandering is perhaps influenced by πλανάσμαι; cf. *OR* 67 πολλὰς δ’ ὁδοὺς ἐλθόντα φροντίδος πλάνοις, *OC* 316 ἦ γνώμη πλανᾷ; Eur. *Hipp.* 283 πλάνον φρενῶν, LSJ⁹ s.v. πλανάω II 5.

24 κἀγὼ θελοντῆς τῷδ’ ὑπεζύγην πόνῳ. ‘And I submitted myself to this task as a volunteer.’ Yoking metaphors imply external compulsion: cf. 123, Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1389–90, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 218. Odysseus’ voluntary assumption of the yoke is a paradox (cf. Matthew 11.28–30) which emphasises his eagerness for the common good; ‘there could be no clearer contrast with the wildness, self-sufficiency, arrogance and unruliness of Ajax’ (Gasti (1992) 87 n. 27). For the –θην suffix with middle sense cf. 1184 μεληθείς, Eur. *Held.* 757 ὑποδεχθείς, Moorhouse 176. R. Allan (2006) 118–19 argues that ὑπεζύγην is a true passive, but θελοντῆς makes this unlikely.

Manuscripts divide between θελοντῆς and (the great majority) θελοντής; the former is classical. The difference might have been apparent in performance. (Adding or removing an elision mark does challenge manuscript authority, as such marks could theoretically descend from S.’s original text written with *scriptio plena*.)

Dawe’s transposition of this line after 28 (in his third edition; justified at (1998) 118–19 = (2007) 240) simplifies the chronology: Odysseus begins to track Ajax after he has been named as a suspect. Moreover, as Dawe notes, the paraphrase in the scholia (p. 20 Chr.) διὸ θελοντῆς τοῦτον ὑπέστην τὸν κίνδυνον, ἵνα γνῶ τάληθές, πάντων τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ γεγονότος εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναγόντων is at least consistent with a text which has the line in this position. But after ‘everyone accused him’ (28), we would expect ‘I took on the task (of finding him)’, not ‘*this* task’. Coming after 18–23, however, demonstrative τῷδ’ has the sense ‘the one which you have seen me carrying out’, with the line forming the conclusion to this subsection of the speech. Odysseus then details the events which led him to this task; as we move swiftly from the picture of the dead animals, to the universal condemnation of Ajax, to the sight of him bounding over the plain, this prosaic line would slow down the narrative.

25–7 ἐφθαρμένas γὰρ ὀρτίως εὐρίσκομεν | λείας ἀπάσας καὶ κατηναρισμέναs | ἐκ χειρὸs αὐτοῖs ποιμνίων ἐπιστάταιs. ‘For recently we found the entire spoil destroyed and butchered by human hand, together with the overseers of the flocks.’ ‘It was [Ajax’s] hand that did the deed, and Sophocles keeps coming back to this point’ (Renehan (1992) 341, comparing 40, 43, 50, 56–7, 219, and illustrating the idiom; cf. Taddei (2003), De Jong (2006) 78–9). In Fraenkel’s

words (on Aesch. *Ag.* 1495–6), ‘the emphasis is on the strange fact that the herds have been killed by a human hand (not by wild beasts)’. This rules out translations such as ‘from close at hand’ (LL-J/W, *So.*).

The dead animals are repeatedly referred to in the play (cf. 143–7, 175, 185, 229/30–232, 372–6), but the murder of their guardians receives only one more mention, from the chorus (232). (The lack of emphasis that they receive from any source means that Ajax’s failure to mention them is unlikely to be significant, *pace* Knox (1961) 7 = (1979) 131, De Jong (2006) 78 with n. 14.) Their death motivates Odysseus’ present mission: all witnesses to the crime are dead, so he must hunt for evidence. But S. avoids giving it prominence, as Ajax’s killing of the animals is a greater mark of humiliation, and a more pathetic contrast with his intended victims (the Greek army). The dead guardians are thus relegated to an associative dative, which often expresses an extra remarkable detail rather than the main burden of a sentence (cf. fr. 958 *TrGF* ἐδέξατο (sc. Ἀμφιάραον) ῥαγείσα Θηβαία κόνις | αὐτοῖσιν ὄπλοις καὶ τετρωρίστω δίφρῳ, S-D II 164–5). (The herdsman is also killed at Apollod. *Epit.* 5.6; at Quint. Smyrn. 5.433–4 the μηλονόμοι hide under tamarisks by the banks of the river Xanthus to avoid detection.)

γάρ refers back to 21–2 (Denniston 63). ἐναρίζω is exclusively poetic; the intensifying κατα- prefix recurs at Aesch. *Cho.* 347. For the high-style periphrasis ποιμνίων ἐπιστάται cf. Eur. fr. 188.4 *TrGF* ποιμνίοις [Valckenaer; -ίων Stobaeus] ἐπιστατών, S. *OR* 1028 ποιμνίοις ἐπεστάτου, *El.* 702n. L^{ac} is unclear in the facsimile, but may well have read ὑποστάταις (‘supporters’, not classical); for the error cf. 301, *El.* 1246n.

28 τήνδ’ οὖν ἐκείνῳ πᾶς τις αἰτίαν τρέπει. ‘Now, everyone directs the blame against him.’ Ajax’s immediate, universal condemnation (πᾶς being emphasised by τις: cf. 1122, 1163), before the emergence of evidence, suggests strained relations between him and the army (44n.), and anticipates the account of the Judgment of the Arms (41n.) which, the audience may suspect, is the immediate cause.

For οὖν ‘marking a new stage in the sequence of events’ see Denniston 425–6. Instead of τρέπει most manuscripts have νέμει (‘assigns’). But νέμω should mean ‘give as an allotted portion’ (hence τιμὰς νέμω, χάριν νέμω etc.), which does not fit (cf. Dawe, *STS* 1 124). According to Musgrave (followed by Campbell, *PS*), αἰτίαν τρέπει ‘implies an erroneous apportionment of blame’ (cf. Isaeus 8.41 τήν δ’ αἰτίαν εἰς τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἔτρεψεν), but nothing suggests that this sense is mandatory. Valckenaer (1743–6) 2 verso argues that τρέπει is the result of a gloss entering the text, but νέμει is as likely to be a gloss. (Possible cases of this type of error occur at 58, 61, 114, 149, 197, 208, 215, 245/6, 295, 402, 406, 412a, 522, 582, 589, 594, 616/17, 702, 706, 742, 817, 864, 877, 884, 905, 964, [969], 988, 1006, [1030], 1042, 1053, 1124, 1214/15, 1228, 1274, 1357.)

29–31 καὶ μοί τις ὀπτήρ αὐτὸν εἰσιδὼν μόνον | πηδῶντα πεδία σὺν νεορ-
 ράντῳ ξίφει | φράζει τε κἀδήλωσεν: ‘And an eye-witness who saw him, bound-
 ing over the plains on his own, his sword freshly flowing with blood, told me
 and made things clear.’ For ὀπτήρ cf. fr. 314.83 *TrGF* (Silenus looks for an
 ὀπτήρ . . . ἢ κατήκοος to help him in the hunt), Plaut. *Truc.* 489 *oculatus testis*.
 Eye-witness testimony was especially significant (cf. 66–7, *El.* 892–919n.).

μόνος is predicated of Ajax at 47, 294, 467, 796, 1283; the repeated use
 suggests a fundamental characteristic. He himself uses the word at 348/9 (n.),
 349/50, 359, 461, 467, and his son Eurysaces as it were inherits his father’s
 adjective (511, 985). See further 4n.

For πηδῶντα πεδία cf. Eur. *Ba.* 307 πηδῶντα . . . πλάκα, 874a θρώσκη
 πεδίον and (for the accusative of extent of space travelled) S. *Aj.* 845, 877–8,
 995, Diggle (1984a) 59 = (1994) 287, Moorhouse 44. The verb refers to Ajax’s
 mad running and triumphant leaps (so De Jong (2006) 77; cf. 1279, 833). Ajax
 is now guiding slow-moving animals back to his encampment, but thanks to
 S.’s partial revelation of the action, the audience does not yet know that. When
 they do, S. uses less colourful verbs of motion (63 κομίζεται, 296 ἐσῆλθε).

For δηλώω, δῆλος of the sighting of prey see Van de Wijnpersse (1929) 41–3.

31–3 εὐθέως δ’ ἐγὼ | κατ’ ἵχνος ἔσσω, καὶ τὰ μὲν σημαίνομαι, | τὰ δ’ ἐκπέ-
 πληγμαι, κοῦκ ἔχω μαθεῖν ὅπου. ‘Straight away I dart on his track, and some
 features of the situation I can make out, but as to others I am thrown off course,
 and I cannot work out where he is.’ Odysseus emphasises the immediacy of
 his reaction: cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.386 (Achilles) αὐτίκ’ ἐγὼ πρῶτος κελόμην θεὸν
 ἰλάσκεσθαι.

κατ’ ἵχνος (‘on his track’: Pearson on fr. 898) forms a unit with ἔσσω
 (Fraenkel (1977) 4 compares Latin *investigo*); thus τὰ μὲν . . . τὰ δέ do not look
 back to ἵχνη understood. ἔσσω for the unmetrical αἶσσω of the manuscripts
 is owed to Livineius ‘p’ (cf. 258). Livineius’s readings, in the margin of an
 Aldine now in the Wren Library of Trinity College, Cambridge (shelfmark
 Adv. d.4.1), are marked with the initials ‘p’ and ‘V’. Ll-J/W (*So.*, pp. 269–
 75) plausibly argue that ‘p’ marks a conjecture by Livineius (standing for e.g.
 ‘proprium’, ‘propositio’, or ‘possis’), while ‘V’ indicates the reading of one or
 more Vatican manuscripts (cf. the note on the title-page ‘q(ui) contulit Roma[e]
 ad MS’).

For σημαίνομαι of identifying tracks cf. [Opp.] *Cyn.* 1.454 μυζωτῆρσι κύνες
 δὲ πανίχνια σημήναντο, Van de Wijnpersse (1929) 42–3; also S. fr. 314.106
TrGF σαφῶ[ς γ]ὰρ αὖθ’ ἕκαστα σημαίνει τῷδε and σημεία at *Ant.* 257–8.
 ἐκπέπληγμαι ‘continues the metaphor: it is not that Odysseus is mentally
 stunned or astonished, but he is, as it were, *thrown off* course, off the trail’
 (Dawe, *STS* 1 126; so also Ll-J/W, *So.*, citing the key parallel Eur. *Ion* 635–6
 οὐδέ μ’ ἐξέπληξ’ ὁδοῦ | πονηρὸς οὐδεῖς).

Instead of ὄπου, Jouanna (1977) 179 n. 3 advocates the majority variant ὅτου ('I cannot work out who the tracks belong to') on the ground that it marks Odysseus' reluctance to blame Ajax in the absence of proof. But Odysseus is tracking Ajax alone, even though he is not certain of his guilt (20; cf. Dawe, *STS* 1 124–6, Ferrari (1983) 21–2). Moreover, Athena has already said that Odysseus is investigating whether or not Ajax is inside (3–7), presumably because the tracks of his quarry have been hard to follow. This is how we first encounter Odysseus: οὐκ ἔχει μαθεῖν ὄπου Αἴας ἐστίν. For confusion of the words MLW cites *OR* 117, *Phil.* 1308. For the absence of a verb in the subordinate clause cf. 103, 118, 890, *Ar. Ach.* 748, Bruhn §27.v.

34 καιρόν δ' ἐφήκεις: 'You have arrived opportunistically.' For adverbial καιρόν cf. Kannicht on *Eur. Hel.* 479, K–G 1 314–15 Anm. 15.

34–5 πάντα γὰρ τὰ τ' οὖν πάρος | τὰ τ' εἰσέπειτα σὴ κυβερνώμαι χερί. 'For in all things, both in the past and in the future, I am steered by your hand.' Odysseus tactfully requests assistance: since Athena has helped him before (1–2n.), she should help him now (the *da quia dedisti* concept of ancient prayer). Unlike Ajax (112–13), he does not set limits on the extent of Athena's guidance; yet his closing comments (121–6) reveal a surprising distance from the goddess's attitude.

τ' οὖν . . . τε (*hapax*: Denniston 420) is parallel to εἴτ' οὖν . . . εἴτ', which denotes indifference to which alternative is preferred (*El.* 199n.). For κυβερνώμαι predicated of the divine cf. *Pind. P.* 5.122–3 Διός τοι νόος μέγας κυβερνᾷ | δαίμον' ἀνδρῶν φίλων, *Hermolochus fr.* 846.4 *PMG* θεὸς δὲ πάντας ἶεν κινδύνους θνατοῦς† κυβερνᾷ, D–K III 248 s.v. κυβερνᾷν, Van Nes (1963) 127; also Latin *guberno* (*TLL* VI/2 2351.17–63).

For the hand as the source of divine force cf. *Hom. Il.* 1.97, West (1997) 223–4. Dawe regards χερί as 'a literal-minded substitute' for the 'old and superior reading' φρενί (*STS* 1 126). Rather, original χερί invited replacement by φρενί because Athena was not literally providing manual direction (LJ–J/W, *So.*); cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 1448 ἡ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναγνον ἐκλιπὼν χεῖρα;, where 'the variant φρένα looks like a pedantic correction by someone concerned to insist that Th<eus> had not killed <Hippolytus> with his own hand' (Barrett *ad loc.*). For the reverse corruption see 46n. For other changes made on a similar principle see 114–15n., 1366n.

36–50 Athena has provided information about the present: Ajax is inside the hut. Now she goes back in time, confirming Odysseus' suspicions as to the perpetrator of the killings. The change from short *rheseis* to stichomythia, as well as being attractive for variety's sake, allows the gradual revelation of Ajax's guilt (39), motive (41), and plan (43, 47); his near success (45, 49), and the reason for his failure (45). It then yields to a further, longer *rhesis* which begins

with Athena's climactic intervention (51–4), changing the narrative pace at the crucial point. Through the stichomythia we see Odysseus' reactions to each piece of news, which are characterised by growing amazement and incredulity (M. Heath (1987) 170 n. 10). Ajax's extraordinary reaction to the Judgment of the Arms bewilders even his enemy.

Grief, pain, and anger were expected in a defeated contestant. Pindar imagines how unsuccessful competitors κατὰ λαύρας... ἐχθρῶν ἀπάοροι | πτώσσονται, συμφορᾷ δεδαγμένοι (*P.* 8.86–7), while in Corinna Helicon is λοῦπησι κά[θ]εκτος | [χολεπ]ῆσιν after his defeat by Cithaeron in a singing contest decided by vote (fr. 654.29–30 *PMG*). Attempting to kill the judges and one's comrades was not expected, however. Ajax's modern defenders seek an epic precedent in Achilles' contemplated assault on Agamemnon (*Il.* 1.188–222), but the comparison is to Ajax's disadvantage. Achilles resists his impulse to kill (Athena intervenes to guide him, but the choice is his); Ajax acts on it. Achilles' reaction takes place in public, during the day, in hot blood, and even then he manages to repress it; Ajax's attack takes place at night, some hours after the Judgment (cf. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 17, Blundell (1989) 70 n. 50). Achilles has but one target; Ajax is bent on indiscriminate slaughter. The claim, on the basis of the *Iliad* passage, that 'his rage was the normal rage of a Greek hero who has lost his honor' (thus Meineck and Woodruff, their translation, p. xix; cf. M. Heath (1987) 172–3), thus fails: we cannot invoke Homeric values to justify mass execution for denial of τιμή (cf. Cairns (1993a) 229 n. 44).

A closer parallel would be Achilles' decision to withdraw from the fighting in the knowledge that this will result in many Greek deaths (*Il.* 1.240–4). But Achilles' exceptional action can hardly be generalised as a 'Homeric value'; and withdrawal of military support is ethically distinct from deliberate killing. Moreover, Achilles withdraws on the advice of a goddess, his mother (1.421–2). Other scholars say that S. avoids passing judgment on Ajax's action (thus March (1991–3) 11 n. 60, Lawrence (2005) 27–8 n. 22); but Odysseus' astonishment (44, 46) makes clear the extent of the transgression.

36–7 ἔγνων, Ὀδυσσεῦ, καὶ πάλαι φύλαξ ἔβην | τῇ σῇ πρόθυμος εἰς ὁδὸν κυναγία. 'I knew it, Odysseus, and some time ago set out on my path, as a guardian eager for your hunt.' Athena is already aware of the reasons for Odysseus' search; his speech, necessary from the audience's point of view, is justified in dramatic terms by Athena's gentle toying with her protégé. The minority variant τῆς σῆς... κυναγίας (so *O^pΔ^s* and the 1532 Colinaeus edition in the unpaginated, anonymous notes at the end of the volume) may be right, as in its other appearance in S. πρόθυμος takes a genitive (*El.* 3n.). But the dative (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.40 οἱ πρόθυμοι τῇ πόλει γεγεννημένοι) probably replaces an εἰς / πρὸς construction to avoid confusion with εἰς ὁδόν. For Athena

as Odysseus' φύλαξ cf. Hom. *Od.* 13.301, 20.47. For the vocalism κυνα– see Björck (1950) 137, 236.

38 ἡ καί, φίλη δέσποινα, πρὸς καιρὸν πονῶ; 'Dear mistress, is my work to the point?' Through ἡ καί 'the whole question . . . is intensified and not any single word' (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 942; cf. Denniston 285). The combination indicates Odysseus' excitement and, later, incredulity (44, 48); Athena uses it in a pretend show of both (97).

δέσποινα addressed to a divinity marks the worshipper's respect (cf. A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 286–8); for its application to Athena cf. [Eur.] *Rhes.* 608, Ar. *Eq.* 763, Pax 271, Headlam on Herodas 4.58, Henrichs (1976) 261–6. φίλε, φίλη are not rare in such addresses to gods, especially with more approachable deities such as Hermes (cf. Hipponax fr. 32.1 *IEG*, Ar. *Nub.* 1478, Pax 416, 718) or Prometheus (Ar. *Av.* 1504, where Pisetaerus is trying to comfort him). Even Zeus is φίλε Ζεῦ in an Attic prayer cited by Marcus Aurelius (*Carm. Pop.* 854.1–2 *PMG* ὕσον ὕσον ὦ φίλε | Ζεῦ κατὰ τῆς ἀρούρας). (Other occurrences of φίλε Ζεῦ are not relevant because they are (i) found in a light-hearted context referring to the god's *amours*, as at Asclepiades *A.P.* 5.167.6 = 875 *HE*, Ant. Thess. *A.P.* 5.109.4 = 362 *GP*, or (ii) used to express surprise or admiration, as at Eupolis fr. 305 *PCG*, Call. 1296 *HE* with Gow and Page. See further Wilamowitz (1924a) II 125, R. Parker (1998) 125.) But Athena is an altogether more fearsome divinity; and only a mortal who 'enjoy[s] a peculiarly intimate relation' with her could address her in this way (Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 174, comparing Hippolytus' address to Artemis at Eur. *Hipp.* 82; add Aesch. *Eum.* 999 παρθένου φίλας φίλοι, of the Athenians). The simplex adjective may be more intimate than the superlative φιλτάτη in 14 (n.). At 105 Ajax addresses Athena ὦ δέσποινα, without φίλη.

For καιρός in this sense cf. *Tr.* 59, Race (1981) 205–6.

39 ὥς ἔστιν ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε τᾶργα ταῦτά σοι. 'Know that these are the deeds of this man.' For ὥς standing (in effect) for ἴσθι ὥς cf. 904, 981, *Phil.* 117, Moorhouse 304, Diggle (1981a) 88. τᾶργα ταῦτα recurs at fr. 10c.4 *TrGF*. The minority variant ἔργα τοῦδε is possible (cf. Dawe, *STS* I 126) but less preferable, as crasis tends to be removed rather than introduced by error. Other errors (real or alleged) involving crasis occur at 190, 574, 648, 725, 806, 1083, 1136, 1225, 1257, 1292, 1336, 1358; of these, only 725 involves crasis wrongly introduced (κοῦ– for οὐ–). τᾶργα mistakenly written ἔργα could have changed places with τοῦδε to preserve the trimeter.

40 καὶ πρὸς τί δυσλόγιστον ὧδ' ἦξεν χέρα; 'And to what purpose did he thus set in motion this incomprehensible act of violence?' καί here conveys surprise in a request for further information (cf. Denniston 309–10). For δυσλόγιστον . . . χέρα cf. 229/30 παραπλήκτω χερὶ; taking the adjective with τί leaves χέρα bare. For transitive ἔσσω (eliminated by conjectures such as

ῥιμαξεν Bergk p. liii, ὤδ' ῥικεν Ll-J/W) cf. Eur. *Hec.* 1070 πόδ' ἐπ' ἄξας, *Or.* 1427–9 αὔραν . . . ἄισσων, perhaps *Ba.* 145–7 (see Dodds), Ap. Rh. 1.1254 γυμνὸν ἐπαΐσσων παλάμη ξίφος, and the passive at e.g. *OC* 1261 κόμη . . . ἄσσεται. For ἄσσω with χεῖρ cf. Hes. *Th.* 150 = 671 ἑκατὸν μὲν χεῖρες ἅπ' ὤμων ἄσσοντο ('the verb implies agile movement': so West, comparing our passage), perhaps Hom. *Il.* 23.628 (if genuine). In place of χέρα **ρ** have χέρας, but Ajax's culpable hand is always in the singular (cf. 27, 43, 50, 97; in the last of these **ρ** make the same mistake).

41 χόλω βαρυνθεὶς τῶν Ἀχιλλείων δπλων. 'Oppressed by anger because of the arms of Achilles.' This first reference to the Judgment of the Arms, elevated and highlighted through the poetic adjective instead of a genitive (cf. 134, 309, 801, 1239, 1337, *El.* 1117n., K–G 1 261–2), prefigures the theme of Ajax's hatred of Odysseus (78n.) and his explicit denunciation of the Judgment at 441–6. For Ajax's reaction cf. the βαρυνόμενον . . . νόημα identified in Ajax by Podalirius (*Iliu Persis* fr. 2.7–8 *GEF*); so too in *Philoctetes* Neoptolemus, when supposedly deprived of the arms, is afflicted by ὀργή βαρεῖα (368) and χόλος (374). For 'heavy anger' cf. further 656, 1017, Eur. *Med.* 1265–6 φρενοβαρῆς [Seidler: φρενῶν βαρὺς codd.] | χόλος, Padel (1992) 83 with n. 22. The genitives depend on the whole verbal notion χόλω βαρυνθεὶς (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 5 οὗ δὴ χολωθεῖς, Pearson on fr. 697; also Pind. *N.* 7.25 ὀπλων χολωθεῖς), not χόλω alone.

42 τί δῆτα ποίμναις τήνδ' ἐπεμπίπτει βάσιν; 'Why then did he fall upon the flocks like this?' δῆτα in questions 'always has a logical connective force' (Denniston 269); cf. 109, 214, 377, 466, 518, 537, 540, 879/80, [969], 986, 1360. For ἐπεμπίπτει βάσιν Pearson (1912a) 210 compares *Tr.* 339 τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν; fr. 314.174 *TrGF* ἄλλ' εἴ' [ἐ]φίστω τριζύγης οἶμον βάσιν [*suppl.* Hunt; [ἄ]φίστω Pearson; cf. Lloyd-Jones (1994) 140–2 = (2005) 127–8], Eur. *Held.* 802 ἐκβάς . . . πόδα, Diggle (1981a) 37; cf. also 19 βάσιν κυκλοῦντ' (n.). For τήνδ' see 289–91n. For βάσιν see 7–8n.

43 δοκῶν ἐν ὑμῖν χεῖρα χραινέσθαι φόνω. 'Thinking that he was staining his hand with your blood.' For ἐν ὑμῖν cf. 366, 971, 1091–2, 1315, Eur. fr. 781.1 *TrGF* ἥν νεκροῖς θ.ρ.(.)γυαί † [θρασύνεται Diggle], Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1320. The gloss ὑμῶν in G (*coni.* Nauck⁴ p. 179) simplifies the sense. χραινῶ of bloody killing (cf. *OC* 368 χραινέσθαι πόλιν, Aesch. *Suppl.* 265–6 παλαιῶν αἱμάτων μιᾶσματος | χρανθεῖσ(α) . . . γαῖα) conveys disapproval, reflecting Athena's perspective.

44 ἥ καὶ τὸ βούλευμ' ὥς ἐπ' Ἀργείοις τόδ' ἦν; 'So was this plan directed against the Argives?' This most grave offence (cf. Rosivach (1975)) features prominently in the near-lynching of Teucer by the army (721–30, especially 726–7) and Menelaus' defence of his decision to deny Ajax burial (1055–6). It also underlies passages describing or implying hostility between Ajax and

the troops (cf. 28n., 151–3, 408–408/9, 560–1, 843–4, Knox (1983) 10–11, Budelmann (2000) 233 n. 64).

ῆ καὶ (38n.) highlights Odysseus' astonishment that Ajax should target the Greeks as a whole. The variant βούλημ ('will, desire') is well attested (including Σ rec. Ar. *Plut.* 493d = p. 132 Chantry, attributed to Musurus, according to which this reading is found ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν Σοφοκλείων ἀντιγραφῶν), but perhaps too intellectual: Odysseus is concerned with the plan, and moves to Ajax's intention only at 46. For confusion between these nouns see Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 993. ὥς 'marks the intention of Ajax (which was frustrated)' (Jebb): cf. *Phil.* 58 πλεῖς δ' ὥς πρὸς οἶκον with Jebb, *Tr.* 532 ὥς ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ, Pearson (1930) 156 (on *OC* 71 ὥς πρὸς τί;), S–D II 667 (12).

45 κἄν ἐξεπράξεν, εἰ κατημέλησ' ἐγώ. 'Yes, and he would have accomplished his purpose, if I had been neglectful.' Ajax's βούλημα was on the point of becoming a πράγμα (so Σ p. 26 Chr.): cf. *Phil.* 554–6 νέα (*coni.*) | βουλεύματ' ἐστὶ, κοῦ μόνον βουλεύματα | ἀλλ' ἔργα δρώμεν(α), Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 649–50. Instead of ἐξεπράξεν (cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 723 καὶ τόδ' ἐξεπράξεν), L and its scholia have ἐξεπράξατ', which may be reflected in Hesych. ε 3736 (II 123 Latte) ἐξεπράξατο· ἐφόνευσεν. According to Ll–J/W (*So.*), 'Sophocles . . . may well have meant the middle to be reflexive with the sense "achieved it for himself", i.e. "succeeded in his enterprise"'. S. can show fondness for the middle (cf. R. Allan (2006) 114–15), although there is no example with this meaning. Ll–J/W claim not to be acting 'out of reverence for L'; but would they have preferred a minority reading with unparalleled sense in, say, Q? Dawe, *STS* I 126, points to L's similar mistake at *Phil.* 10 (κατέιχετ' for κατέιχ', although there it is not alone in error). Jebb compares *OR* 287 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν ἀργοῖς οὐδὲ τοῦτ' ἐπραξάμην, but there 'Oedipus was not, like Ajax, the actual executant' (Pearson (1923) 19); MLW suggests that the verb is influenced by expressions with ποιέομαι such as Hdt. I.118.2 οὐκ ἐν ἐλαφρῷ ἐποיעύμην. Ll–J/W there print ἐπράξαμεν (*coni.* Shilleto (1859) 311), on the ground that 'the middle . . . is not the voice we should expect' (*So.*).

Some scholars accept neither reading. Enger (1860) 96 suggests ἐξεπράξε γ' (for καὶ . . . γε in answers see Denniston 158), which could have become ἐξεπράξε τ', and then 'corrected' to either ἐξεπράξατ' or ἐξεπράξεν. Similarly, ἐξεπράξ' ἄν (*coni.* Pierson (pre-1759) 194 recto) might be the source of each of the variants. But both these suggestions require an original reading to be corrupted, without leaving a trace, in different ways in separate parts of the tradition. It is more economical to accept one of the transmitted readings and assume a single process of corruption (cf. 706n.).

46 ποίαισι τόλμαις ταῖσδε καὶ φρενῶν θράσει; 'What was this daring and boldness of mind with which he acted?' The modal dative 'describes the circumstances which accompany the action' (Moorhouse 90). Odysseus

effectively asks ‘How did he go about it?’, with the datives conveying amazement and disapproval. ταῖσδε looks back to Athena’s last statement confirming Ajax’s extraordinary decision to attack the army (as in Campbell’s paraphrase ‘What bold attempt inspired by recklessness do your words imply?’); cf. ποῖος with ὅδε at *Phil.* 1204 ποῖον ἔρεῖς τόδ’ ἔπος; (‘What is it that you are going to say?’), following on from Philoctetes’ ὦ ξένοι, ἐν γέ μοι εὐχος ὀρέξατε). The minority variant χειρῶν for φρενῶν coheres less well with θράσει. For the corruption cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 900 and (in reverse) 35n.; note also χεῖρ in 40, 43, 50.

47 νύκτωρ ἔφ’ ὑμᾶς δόλιος ὀρμάται μόνος. ‘By night he stealthily rushed at you, alone.’ There is an irony after the preceding line: a secret nocturnal mission is hardly bold or daring. For nocturnal δόλος cf. *El.* 1396–7 δόλον σκότῳ | κρύψας (n.), Eur. fr. 288.1 *TrGF* δόλοι δὲ καὶ σκοτεῖνὰ μηχανήματα. For μόνος of Ajax see 29–31n.

48 ἥ καὶ παρέστη κάπῃ τέρμ’ ἀφίκετο; ‘So did he get close and reach his goal?’ For incredulous ἥ καὶ see 38n.

49 καὶ δὴ ’πὶ δισσαῖς ἦν στρατηγίσιν πύλαις. ‘He was already at the gates of the two commanders.’ καὶ δὴ ‘already’ stresses that Ajax was only seconds from his aim. ‘The line between “actually happening” and “happening now” is often difficult to draw. Hence καὶ δὴ frequently approximates in sense . . . to ἦδη, though it is always more vivid and dramatic in tone’ (Denniston 252).

δισσαὶ στρατηγίδες πύλαι ‘the twofold relating-to-generals gates’ could mean ‘the twin gates of the headquarters’ or (taking the two adjectives closely together) ‘the gates of the two commanders’ (cf. *El.* 1071–2 διπλῇ φύλοπις ‘twofold strife’ = ‘the warring pair of sisters’). But the revelation that Ajax was on the verge of killing the two leaders of the expedition (cf. 57 etc.) has greater significance than the news that their hut had double doors. Jebb’s objection ‘Could δισσά ὀδελφῶν ἄρματα (*e.g.*) mean, “a chariot belonging to two brothers?”’ would only hold if our text read δισσαὶ στρατηγῶν πύλαι.

Agamemnon and Menelaus are thus imagined to share a single dwelling, an unHomeric detail demanded by dramatic necessity. Teucer will later be assailed by the Greeks at the same location (721–2).

50 καὶ πῶς ἐπέσχε χεῖρα μαιώσσαν φόνου; ‘And how did he restrain his hand in its eagerness for slaughter?’ Athena has already answered this question in 45; for another such repetition see 68–70n. φόνου could depend on μαιώσσαν or ἐπέσχε (‘. . . restrain his eager hand from slaughter’, with an ablative genitive after a gap as at 51–2); the former gives more bite to the metaphor (for which cf. Hom. *Il.* 13.77–8 περὶ δούρατι χεῖρες ἄππτοι | μαιώσιν, of Ajax’s hands). μαιμάω recurs in tragedy only at Aesch. *Suppl.* 895, there again probably an epic touch (see FJ/W).

For καί introducing a surprised question see 40n. The minority variants μαργῶσαν (*coni.* Nauck (1866) 653) and διψῶσαν are ‘likely to have been learned reminiscences’ (Dawe, *STS* 1 83). For the former cf. Eur. *Hec.* 1128 μέθες μ’ ἐφεῖναι τῇδε μαργῶσαν χέρα, *Phoen.* 1156, perhaps *Her.* 1005 (with Nauck’s conjecture); for the latter Tr. Adesp. fr. 96 *TrGF* ἴσχειν κελεύω χεῖρα διψῶσαν φόνου, Lyc. *Alex.* 1171 μαιμῶν κορέσσαι χεῖρα διψῶσαν φόνου. N. Wilson (1976) 173 notes that Lycophron, a popular author in Byzantium, was an obvious source for such a reminiscence; while the *Suda*’s reading (μ 327 = III 340.8–10 Adler) μαιμῶσα . . . καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ διψῶσαν ‘points to the use of διψᾶν as a gloss on μαιμᾶν’.

51–73 Athena begins by proudly asserting how she checked Ajax’s course (51–2n.; cf. 59–60). His subsequent activity, for all its vigour and violence, is merely the consequence of the goddess’s climactic intervention. The diversion of Ajax’s impulse from the commanders to the animals presupposes the mentality underlying the ἀποπομπή prayer form, in which worshippers ask for evil to depart from them and settle on an alternative target (cf. *El.* 647n. and the story of the Gadarene swine, Mark 5.1–13). On one level, then, this is a standard and credible mechanism by which Athena ensures the safety of the Greek leaders. But on another, Athena relishes Ajax’s delusion for its own sake, taking obvious enjoyment in his misplaced dexterity and on one occasion veering into outright sarcasm (61n.). Her narrative is characterised by complex, elevated expressions (noted by Long (1968) 96–7, who cites 51–2, 54, 55, 64, 69–70), which contrast with the degrading actions which she describes. The tone in the final three lines becomes rougher and simpler, as Athena summons her plaything for further humiliation.

51–2 ἐγὼ σφ’ ἀπείργω, δυσφόρους ἐπ’ ὄμμασι | γνώμας βαλοῦσα, τῆς ἀνηκέστου χαρᾶς ‘It was I who held him back from this irresistible joy, by casting intolerable fantasies on his eyes’. Emphatically-positioned ἐγὼ is ‘an expression of divine majesty and power’ (Jebb). The vivid historic present ἀπείργω should be preferred over ἀπείρξα for this most crucial action in Athena’s narrative (*El.* 725n.).

Campbell’s correct explanation of δυσφόρους (‘the natural meaning of “grievous,” “intolerable,” is slightly modified by the association of “hard to resist,” or “bear up against.” Ajax could not withstand the fatal illusion’) follows Schneidewin (‘Wahnbilder . . . unter deren Wucht der Verstand erliegt’, ‘illusions to whose force the intellect succumbs’). The scholia (p. 269 Chr.) take it to mean παραφόρους (*coni.* Hartung; ‘misleading fancies’: Easterling (1993b) 81), but there is no parallel for this sense. It is strange to hear of ‘intolerable fantasies’ cast on the eyes rather than implanted in the mind; hence Madvig (1871–84) I 206–7 conjectured λήμας (‘sore eyes’; cf. Ar. *Plut.* 581, where γνώμαις replaces λήμας in some manuscripts), though the sense

will hardly do. But as the fantasies affect Ajax's sight, and as the eyes are a traditional target in comparable expressions (cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 950 μέλαιναν κῆρ' ἐπ' ὄμμασιν βαλὼν, 1534–5 †δῶμασιν ἄριον σκότον' ὄμμασι | σοῖσι βαλὼν), the text is probably sound. Cf. 450–3n. (ἐμβάλλω).

For ἀνέκестου (literally 'incurable') and Triclinius's ἀνειακστου cf. *El.* 888 θάλληι τῷδ' ἀνέκεστω πυρί ('you are warmed by this irresistible fire') with n. The paradox stresses Athena's power: she frustrates what appeared irresistible. So too at *El.* 888 Electra uses the term of a belief which has overcome Chrysothemis, but will not master her.

Others take τῆς ἀνέκестου χαρᾶς with δυσφόρους γνώμας (cf. Jebb's 'the tyrannous fancies of his baneful joy'). But γνῶμαι χαρᾶς is not natural Greek, and the article adds to the difficulty (so Ll-J/W, *Sa.*). Some scholars have emended χαρᾶς to φορᾶς ('headlong rush'; Reiske *teste* Jebb, but not in Reiske (1753)) or φθορᾶς ('act of destruction'; Rauchenstein (1873) 581). But while the transmitted text is compressed ('joy' standing for 'act which would bring him joy'), it is not obscurely so. It prepares for Ajax's later ghoulish delight in describing his exploits (91–3 etc.).

53–4 καὶ πρὸς τε ποίμνας ἐκτρέπω σύμμεικτά τε | λείας ἄδαστα βουκόλων φρουρήματα 'and I diverted him against the flocks and the various beasts of the spoil guarded by the herdsmen and not yet distributed' (Lloyd-Jones, adapted). For τε 'placed after a word preceding the two co-ordinated words (or word-groups) and common to both, instead of after the first co-ordinated word' (Denniston 518) cf. 654, Diggle *ap.* Bond on Eur. *Her.* 477. Before Schaefer (see his edition, 1 228), editors punctuated with a comma before ἄδαστα, but σύμμεικτα λείας is obscure, and it is easier to take φρουρήματα (here 'something guarded'; elsewhere 'guard', as at e.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 449) with twin genitives (cf. 308–9, 731–2, Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 170, Bruhn §33.1), one defining (λείας), one possessive (βουκόλων). Pearson writes σύμμεικτα for transmitted σύμμικτα. E-vocalism is standard in classical inscriptions, the earliest of which date to 398/7; but graffiti on two fifth century vases, each with plain iota, leave open the possibility that the manuscripts have the correct form (see Threatte II 623–4).

55 ἔνθ' εἰσπεσὼν ἔκειρε πολύκερων φόνον | κύκλῳ ῥαχίζων 'There he fell upon the horned beasts and killed many by hacking them, cleaving spines all around him'; literally 'he was hacking a much-horned killing'. As at *Ant.* 972–3 ἔλκος | τυφλωθέν (implying 'he inflicted a wound by blinding them'), both the verbal and nominal element of the phrase have a transitive sense (*El.* 123n.). For similar expressions involving φόνος cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 1205 πρῶσης φόνον, Diggle (1974) 15 = (1994) 106–7. For πολύκερων φόνον cf. Eur. *Her.* 1272–3 τετρασκελῆ | . . . πόλεμον ('war with four-footed creatures'; literally

‘four-footed war’). φόνος of killing animals has an unusually strong negative colouring (cf. 309, Finglass (2006b) 190).

56–8 κἀδόκει μὲν ἔσθ’ ὅτε | δισσοὺς Ἀτρείδης αὐτόχειρ κτείνειν ἔχων, | ὅτ’ ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλον ἐμπίτνων στρατηλατῶν. ‘And now he thought he was killing the two Atridae with his own hand as he gripped them, now this general, now that, as he fell upon them.’ The sentence is based on an ἔσθ’ ὅτε... ἔσθ’ ὅτε construction (cf. S–D II 648–9 n. 2); the second clause has its ἔσθ’ understood, and contains the polyptoton ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλον (cf. Diggle (1989) 201 = (1994) 347, Gygli-Wyss (1966) 53 n. 5), further dividing the sentence and conveying the multiplicity of Ajax’s targets. Rather than naming Odysseus as an accompaniment to the Atridae (cf. 387–91), S. emphasises Ajax’s desire for revenge on all the generals. μὲν goes with δέ in 59 (so Campbell). Jebb adopts Campbell’s rejected alternative, whereby the construction runs ἔστι μὲν ὅτε... (ἔστι δέ) ὅτε, but the need to understand two words before the second ὅτε, as well as the position of μὲν, makes this unlikely. αὐτόχειρ goes with κτείνειν, not ἔχων, since it is typically used of acts of conspicuous violence (cf. *El.* 1019, *Ant.* 1175). ἄλλον depends on κτείνειν, not ἐμπίτνων (which would need a dative). In 58 the variant τότ’ (Π², *coni.* Blaydes¹) gives the wrong kind of coordination with ὅτε, and probably originated from failure to understand the construction.

Π² reads δοιούς, an epic word not attested in tragedy. According to Hunt (1927a) 131, ‘δοιους has apparently been corrected (by the second hand?) to δισσοὺς, for though the deletion of the first ο is indistinct, there is above the line on the edge of a lacuna a vestige of ink which suits the top of σ and would be otherwise unaccounted for’. I see no evidence for a correction in the online papyrus image.

In place of ἔχων the scholiast to L records παρών as a γράφεται variant, while Toup (who died in 1785) *ap.* Anonymous C (1817) 372 conjectures ἐλών. But for otiose ἔχων cf. *Tr.* 760–1 ταυροκτονεῖ μὲν δώδεκ’ ἐντελείς ἔχων | λείας ἀπαρχὴν βοῦς.

ἐμπίτνων is owed to Elmsley (1805/6 edn), who reinterprets the minority reading ἐμπιτνῶν; the same change is required at 185 and 300. For the choice see Finglass (2009g) 217–19. The unmetrical majority reading ἐμπίπτων shows substitution of the commoner word of similar shape (cf. 159, 274, 539, 647, 761, 1016, [1030], 1075), perhaps via the intrusion of a gloss (28n.; cf. C^{gl} at 185 προπίπτων, on πιτνῶν, and *OC* 1754). The variant ἐμπεσών (recorded by the scholiast to L) may be a metrical correction (cf. Diggle (1991) 61), perhaps encouraged by εἰσπεσών in 55; it is unlikely to be right, as Ajax’s repeated lunges require a present participle. K offers προσπίπτων above the line, together with ἄλλω for ἄλλον. Perhaps someone who did not see that κτείνειν governed this clause conjectured ἄλλω to go with the participle, and changed

the prefix to avoid hiatus. On the basis of the minority reading ἐμπίπτειν Broadhead (*ap.* Stanford) suggests ἐμπιτνείν (ἐμπιτνεῖν *iam* Kayser (1839) 4), but the ensuing opposition between κτείνειν and ἐμπιτνείν is obscure.

στρατηλάτης (1223) is attested in tragedy and Herodotus; perhaps it was an Ionic word which sounded poetic in Attic.

59–60 ἐγὼ δὲ φοιτῶντ' ἄνδρα μανιάσιν νόσοις | ᾤτρυνον, εἰσέβαλλον εἰς ἔρηκ κακά. 'But as the man raved with maddening sickness I urged, I cast him into the nets of disaster.' For madness sent by a divinity in tragedy cf. Aesch. fr. 319 *TrGF* ἀσφαλὲς θεόθεν μανία, Eur. fr. 472e.9 ἐκ θεοῦ γὰρ προσβολῆς ἐμνημόνην, Tr. Adesp. fr. 296; cf. 'divine sickness' at 186, fr. 650 θεανῆ [θεία Dindorf] νῆσος [Soping: νόσος cod.], ἡ ἐκ θεοῦ, θεία, 680.3, *Ant.* 421, Eur. fr. 286b.4–5 *TrGF* with Kannicht, R. Parker (1983) 243. Papadopoulou (2005) 58 n. 1 cites bibliography on tragic madness. For φοιτάω 'of mental wandering, not physical' see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 141–4, Mattes (1970) 107. ἄνδρα may stress Ajax's weakness in the face of divine action (cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 737–8 τῇδε γὰρ θνητῇ θεὸς | χρήζων μιγῆναι τάσδ' ἐπέρριψεν πλάνας). For the association of madness and sickness cf. Eur. *Or.* 227–8 ὅταν ἀνῆ νόσος | μανιάς, *Ba.* 1060 μανιάδων . . . νόσων [Jackson: μαινάδων . . . νόθων cod.], Diggle (1974) 11 = (1994) 101, (1981a) 54. The datives could also go with the verbs in 60 (and thus be not modal but instrumental, as at Eur. *Or.* 270 ἐκφοβοῖεν μανιάσιν λυσσήμασιν); word order may suggest both senses.

Verbal asyndeton at the start of the trimeter, with the second verb longer (and more violent) than the first, mimetically expresses Athena's vigour (*El.* 719n., adding Arnott on Alexis fr. 88.3 *PCG*). κακά means 'harmful' (cf. Hom. *Il.* 22.395 = 23.24 Ἐκτορα δῖον ἀεικέα μῆδετο ἔργα); Athena is not making a moral judgment or condemning her own action. For the 'nets of disaster' and related expressions cf. Ibycus fr. 287.3–4 *PMGF* ἐς ἄπειρα δίκτυα Κύπριδος ἐσβάλλει, [Aesch.] *PV* 1074–5 Ζεὺς ὕμας | εἰς ἀπρόοπτον πῆμ' εἰσέβαλεν, 1078–9 εἰς ἀπέραντον δίκτυον ἄτης | ἐμπλεχθήσεσθ' ὑπ' ἀνοίας, Aesch. *Ag.* 357–60 ἐπὶ Τροίης πύργοις ἔβαλες στεγανὸν δίκτυον . . . μέγα δουλείας γάγγαμον ἄτης παναλώτου, Garvie on Aesch. *Pers.* 93–100.

The variant εἰς ἐρινύν κακὴν, although itself unmetrical (Ἐρινύς always has a long iota), has prompted emendations. εἰς ἄρκυν κακὴν (Wunder (1823) 55–6) is no improvement on the majority reading, while εἰς ἐριν κακὴν (Hermann¹) gives weaker sense. Keeping the Erinyes, as with ᾠτρυνον εἰς Ἐρινύων ἔρηκ κακά (Hermann (1838) 369) and Ἐρινύων ᾠτρυνον εἰς ἔρηκ κακά (Hermann³), requires extensive rewriting; the former also removes the caesura. The association of madness with the Erinyes (cf. Padel (1992) 177 with n. 39) led to what is probably a bad conjecture.

61 κἄπειτ' ἐπειδὴ τοῦδ' ἐλώφησεν πόνου 'And then, when he had taken his rest from toil'. For ἐπειτα followed by an ἐπειδὴ clause cf. Critias 43 F 19.9

TrGF, Phrynichus fr. 25 *PCG*, Ar. *Vesp.* 1322, *Ran.* 923, *Eccl.* 272, 1100, *Plut.* 695, and in prose (see further Lobeck²⁻³). Most manuscripts have φόνου, but the minority reading gives finer irony: for a moment, Ajax is engaged in a hard night's work, not a killing spree. For the corruption (assisted by parts of φόνος at the end of 43, 50, and 55) cf. *OC* 542, Eur. *Her.* 1279, *IT* 1046, *Cycl.* 471, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 1006–7; possibly Aesch. *Eum.* 132, Gaetulicus *A.P.* 6.331.5 = 195 *FGE*. For confusion between π and φ JD compares 1023, Aesch. *Cho.* 418, Eur. *Held.* 1041, *Hel.* 556. A further variant, κόπου, found in a few late manuscripts (*teste* Hermann¹), will result from the elevation of a gloss on πόνου (28n.)

62–4 τοὺς ζῶντας αὐ δεσμοῖσι συνδήσας βοῶν | ποίμνας τε πάσας εἰς δόμους κομίζεται, | ὥς ἄνδρας, οὐχ ὥς εὐκέρων ἄγραν ἔχων. 'in their turn he bound together the living oxen and all the flocks [in effect 'all the living oxen and flocks'] with bonds and brought them home, as if it were men, not horned creatures, which he had there.' Valckenaer (1743–6) 6 recto suggests ἄγρων for ἔχων; for the corruption (encouraged by ἔχων at the end of 57) and its reverse cf. 382n., 1396–7n., *El.* 703, 1394, *Ant.* 34, 1258.

65 καὶ νῦν κατ' οἴκους συνδέτους ἄκίζεται. 'And now he torments them, bound together, in the house' (Jebb). I write ἄκίζεται rather than αἰκ– because ἀει– contracts to form a long diphthong (cf. West's Teubner Aeschylus, p. xlv); so also at 111, 402.

66–7 δείξω δὲ καὶ σοὶ τήνδε περιφανῆ νόσον, | ὥς πᾶσιν Ἀργείοισιν εἰσιδὼν θροῆς. 'I shall show you too this madness in full view, so that you may see and proclaim it to all the Argives.' Odysseus will see it (εἰσιδὼν) as well as Athena (καὶ σοί), clearly, instead of relying on surmise (περιφανῆ), and hence his words will carry weight with the Greeks (67). For instances where πάντες are the addressees of a public proclamation see Diggle (1996c) 111. For the importance of eye-witness testimony see 29–31n. Odysseus has previously heard, and now he will see.

68–70 Reichard (1880) 14 deletes these lines, objecting to the apparent repetition of the same material in 83–5, when Odysseus seems unaware of information given him here. Approving the deletion, Fraenkel (1963) 106 = (1964) 1413 cites G. J. Toomer's view that the passage was added by someone (probably a director) wanting to eliminate the following stichomythia (cf. Macleod *ap.* Taplin (1977) 146 n. 1 for other possible instances of small interpolations covering larger deletions). However, the repetition is explicable in dramatic terms (cf. 74–88n. and Mastronarde (1979) 80–1 '<Odysseus> fear prevents him from relying on Athena's assurance until her power to affect Aias' sight is explained more precisely'), and can be paralleled in this play (cf. 45 and 50 (n.)), where also Odysseus requires more explicit reassurance regarding divine

intervention in human affairs) and elsewhere in tragedy (cf. Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 211–13, citing *El.* 303–4, 317–18). See further Long (1964) and Dawe, *STS* 1 127–8.

68–9 θαρσῶν δὲ μίμνε – μηδὲ συμφορὰν δέχου – | τὸν ἄνδρ'. 'Take courage and await the man, and do not take it as a disaster.' This punctuation (in LKA, marked by raised dots) is advocated by Lobeck¹ (on μηδὲ συμφορὰν δέχου: 'haec διὰ μέσου. Θαρσῶν μίμνε τὸν ἄνδρα'). Renehan (1992) 342 cites bibliography on the διὰ μέσου construction, while Schaefer (his edition, 1 228) quotes the decisive parallel: Hom. *Il.* 13.476–7 ὥς μένεν Ἰδομενεὺς δουρικλυτός, οὐδ' ὑπεχώρει, | Αἰείαν. My translation of μηδὲ συμφορὰν δέχου is Renehan's; Ll-J/W (*So.*) prefer 'do not expect misfortune', citing Hom. *Il.* 9.191, [10.62], *Od.* 9.513–14 (MD adds 12.230–1). Many editors take μηδὲ . . . ἄνδρ' as a single unit, meaning 'do not receive the man as a calamity' (Jebb). But as Renehan notes, 'to talk of *sending away* a man as a disaster is natural [citing Aeschin. 3.253 οὐκ ἀποπέμψεσθε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὡς κοινὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων συμφορὰν;], to which add Ferrari (1983) 24], but "do not *receive* him as a disaster" is as strange a locution as <Ll-J/W> maintain <in *So.*>'.

69–70 ἐγὼ γὰρ ὁμμάτων ἀποστροφούς | αὐγὰς ἀπείρξω σὴν πρόσοψιν εἰσιδεῖν. 'For I will turn away the sight of his eyes so that he does not see your face.' Athena's words imply 'the emissionist theory, that the eyes see by means of the fiery rays which they cast on the external world' (Cairns (2005b) 138, citing (p. 148 n. 51) fr. 157 *TrGF*, Hom. *Od.* 4.150, 19.446; cf. 85). ἀποστροφούς denotes the diverting of Ajax's gaze from one direction to another; distinguish διάστροφοί at 447, which refers to the rolling of a madman's eyes (447–9n.).

L has ἀπείργω; for the corruption from future to present cf. P at 92 (στέφω for στέψω). The same verb undergoes another error of tense at 51 (n.). The objections of Fraenkel (1963) 105–6 = (1964) 1 412–13 to the sense 'face' for πρόσοψις are answered by Long (1964).

71–2 οὗτος, σὲ τὸν τὰς αἰχμαλωτίδας χέρας | δεσμοῖς ἀπευθύνοντα προσμολεῖν καλῶ. 'You there! The man tying their captive hands with fetters, I'm calling you, come out!' Athena's address signals Ajax's degradation; manacled prisoners (parallels at Nisbet and Rudd on Hor. *C.* 3.5.21–2) has become his identifying feature.

For οὗτος in peremptory address cf. 1047, Svennung (1958) 208–12, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 911, Moorhouse 31. According to Wackernagel (1912) 9–10 n. 1 = (1953–79) II 976–7 n. 1, here and at 89 it marks friendly urgency ('freundschaftlich dringlich'); but while it may sometimes have this tone (cf. Dickey (1996) 154–8), the brusque σὲ τόν (*El.* 1445–6n.) tells against it here.

ἀπο– in ἀπευθύνοντα implies ‘behind the back’, an extension of its use denoting separation (Moorhouse 101); cf. ἀποστρέφω at *OR* 1154 οὐχ ὡς τάχος τις τοῦδ’ ἀποστρέψει χέρας;., *Ar. Eq.* 263, *Lys.* 455, *Hom. Od.* 22.172–3, 189–90. The idea of ‘straightening’ in the simplex verb should thus be understood metaphorically, in terms of punishment (see Campbell *ad loc.* and in *PS*, citing *Eur. Ba.* 884–7). Cf. the different extended uses of εὐθύνω and παρευθύνω at 542, 1069.

αἰχμαλωτίδας shows the feminine noun (1226–8n.) as an adjective; elsewhere the adjective is αἰχμάλωτος, –ον.

73 Αἴαντα φωνῶ· στείχε δωμάτων πάρος. ‘You! Ajax! Come in front of the house.’ The accusative expresses the content of the shout (cf. Diggle (1994) 437–8).

74–88 Athena counters Odysseus’ reluctance to meet Ajax with a succession of arguments. She appeals to his bravery (75), points out that he used not to fear Ajax (77), appeals to the pleasure of laughing at enemies (79), and refers to his madness (81). When these arguments fail, she repeats that she will ensure that Ajax does not see Odysseus (83–5). This appears to satisfy him (86), but even then he remains with reluctance (88). These multiple attempts at persuasion convey the extent of the perceived threat. So does the abruptness of Odysseus’ language in 74 and 76, a marked change from his earlier deference (M. Heath (1987) 169). This prospect of personal danger is for the moment Odysseus’ sole reservation. He does not yet object that it would be cruel to watch Ajax (contrast 121–6). This allows dramatic development, but is also psychologically plausible. Odysseus’ reflections on Ajax’s state come naturally after he has seen him humiliated; at the moment, however, he faces the prospect of imminent annihilation.

74 τί ῥᾶς, Ἀθάνα; μηδαμῶς σφ’ ἔξω κάλει. ‘What are you doing, Athena? Don’t continue calling him outside!’ Odysseus shows reasonable concern for his physical safety; there is no implication that he is afraid to face Ajax because ‘no one can match his stature’ (March (1991–3) 12), or that ‘his fear is a measure of Ajax’ greatness’ (Garvie). For μηδαμῶς introducing a strong prohibition at a moment of extreme danger cf. *Phil.* 1300 ἄ, μηδαμῶς, μή, πρὸς θεῶν, μή φῆς βέλους. L omits σφ’; for the error (especially common following sigma) see FJ/W on *Aesch. Suppl.* 999, Diggle (1981a) 59. The nuance of the rare present imperative in address to a deity is hard to gauge (*El.* 643n.).

75 οὐ σῖγ’ ἀνέξη μηδὲ δειλίαν ἄρῃ; ‘Won’t you keep quiet, and not incur cowardice?’ For the first part of Athena’s order cf. fr. 679.1 *TrGF* σύγγνωπτε κἀνάσχεσθε σιγῶσαι, for the second cf. Willink on *Eur. Or.* 502 τὸ σῶφρον... ἔλαβ’ ἂν ἀντὶ συμφορᾶς. The classical second person middle indicative is –η, not –ει (*El.* 380–1n., adding Bergk (1868) 362–3). For strong

commands expressed with an initial negative see S–D II 292–3; for the combination here cf. *Tf.* 1183 οὐ θᾶσσον οἴσεις μῆδ' ἀπιστήσεις ἐμοί, Moorhouse 338.

The two best attested variants for the final verb are both 2nd person active forms of αἶρω, namely ἀρεῖς (future indicative) and ἄρης (aorist subjunctive). Neither is possible, as each has an unmetrical long initial alpha (the former <ἀερώ: K–B II 350). The true form, ἄρη (future indicative middle of ἄρνυμαι), has a short alpha (cf. *OC* 460), and gives the tense expected after ἀνέξη. It is preserved in only two sources: (i) Hesych. α 7144 (I 242 Latte) ἄρη· λήμψη. οἴση. Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι μαστιγοφόρῳ, an entry connected with our passage by Valckenaer (1743–6) 6 recto. (The Hesychius manuscript reads ἄρη, which Alberti (I 524) ‘corrects’ to ἄρη, 2nd person aorist middle of αἶρω, claiming that the entry refers to *Aj.* 129 and 192/3; but as Degani (1966) 42–3 = (2004) 694–5 notes, the verbs in the gloss indicate that the verb in the lemma is future, and so refers to *Aj.* 75.) (ii) A variant in L by a corrector called C⁷ by Campbell, whom Turyn (1949) 140, 146 with n. 92 identifies as the scribe of A. It is unlikely that L’s reading was taken from Hesychius, since ‘there is only one MS of Hesychius now extant [from the fifteenth century] and no reason to think that a great number were current in Byzantium’ (N. Wilson (1976) 174). Hecquet-Devienne (1994) 36–46 discusses interventions by the scribe of A in L.

At 129 and 192/3 manuscripts are split between two forms of αἶρω, namely ἄρη, aorist middle, and ἄρης, aorist active, each with long alpha. The aorist middle forms (i.e. <ἡράμην: see Jebb’s appendix, p. 218) should be preferred on the ground of sense (‘take upon oneself’, rather than ‘lift’: see Jebb, *ibid.*). At 246/7 ἄρεσθαι is aorist middle infinitive of the same verb, from ἡρόμην.

76 μὴ πρὸς θεῶν· ἀλλ' ἐνδον ἀρκέτω μένων. ‘No, by the gods. But let it be enough (for you) that he stays inside.’ Literally, ‘Let him be enough staying inside’, and hence ‘Be content that he . . .’ (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 378–80, at II 198 with n. 1).

77 τί μὴ γένηται; ‘In case what happens?’ Cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 544 (same phrase), S. *El.* 1276 τί μὴ ποιήσω;

πρόσθεν οὐκ ἀνὴρ ὄδ' ἦν; ‘Was he not a man before?’ (cf. Anonymous B (1811) 127, Dobree (pre-1825) II 42). Ajax was a mere man before; nothing has changed, so why should Odysseus fear him now? The thought is especially pointed in the mouth of a goddess: how could anyone be afraid of a *man*? Cf. *OC* 567 ἔξοιδ' ἀνὴρ ὦν (‘I know that I am (only) a man’) and Ar. *Nub.* 1421–2 οὐκ οὖν ἀνὴρ ὁ τὸν νόμον θεῖς τοῦτον ἦν τὸ πρῶτον, | ὥσπερ σὺ κἀγώ. (In the latter Dawe, *STS* I 129 objects that ‘the addition of “like you and me” could just as well be said to be evidence that ἀνὴρ by itself was *not* enough’,

but the more natural articulation makes the phrase an elaboration rather than an explanation of the preceding line.)

Others take ἀνὴρ in the sense ‘strong, brave man’ (cf. 1238, Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.24, Beroutsos on Men. *Asp.* 242–3, Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 26.2); the goddess then means ‘Ajax was brave before, yet you didn’t fear him then; why fear him now?’ But it is Ajax’s madness, not his manliness, which concerns Odysseus. According to Markland (pre-1776), Odysseus in 78 interrupts Athena’s sentence, which then would mean ‘Before, was not this man . . .’. But it is not clear what she would go on to say; and as her utterance makes sense as it is, the audience would naturally assume that it was complete. Ll-J/W (*So.*) modify Markland’s suggestion, asserting that Odysseus does not interrupt Athena but ‘rather . . . finishes her sentence’. But why would Athena have gone on to make a point directly opposed to her case? Odysseus’ γε would also be out of place in a putative single utterance containing 77–8.

For ὅδε of a character not on stage cf. 98, *El.* 540n.

78 ἐχθρός γε τῷδε τάνδρῳ καὶ πανῶν ἔτι. ‘Yes, one hostile to *this* man, as he still is.’ For γε which ‘carries on a sentence which is already complete in itself. . . giving a new and malicious turn to the thought’ (Denniston 137) cf. 876; for ὅδε ἀνὴρ referring to the speaker cf. *Phil.* 1036, Eur. *El.* 43. This is the first reference to Ajax’s hatred of Odysseus, as opposed to the army as a whole; the earlier mention of the Judgment of the Arms (41n.) prepares for this, however. It recurs at 122, and then in the mouths of Ajax and his supporters (Ajax: 303, 379–82, 387–91, 445–6; chorus: 148–9, 190, 954/5–958; Tecmessa: 952–3, 971).

79 οὐκ οὖν γέλως ἡδιστος εἰς ἐχθροὺς γελᾶν; ‘Well, isn’t laughing at enemies the sweetest form of laughter?’ Athena picks up Odysseus’ ἐχθρός to make a new point in her favour. Her statement expresses a standard item of Greek morality (cf. Dover (1974) 182–3), to which Ajax himself would subscribe (302–4; cf. 1042–3). So too the idea that experiencing the laughter of enemies is most bitter is a commonplace (367n.).

In the manuscripts, this line is a statement beginning οὐκοῦν. Valckenaer (1743–6) 6 verso adds the question mark; οὐκ οὖν is owed to Markland (pre-1776). For this particle introducing a lively question see Denniston 431 (also 1051n.). ἡδὺς γέλως (cf. 1011) is an epic combination; cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.270, Faulkner on *Hom. Hym.* 5.49. For εἰς plus accusative denoting the object of mockery see Headlam on Herodas 1.77.

80 ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀρκεῖ τοῦτον ἐν δόμοις μένειν. ‘It’s enough for *me* that he stays at home.’ The near-repetition of 76 may convey that Odysseus’ attitude is unchanged. ἐμοὶ μὲν has the nuance ‘Whatever others might think, I . . .’ (cf. *El.* 372, Bruhn §156.11, Denniston 381–2). The variant εἰς δόμους cannot go with

μένω. The error may have arisen from εἰς ἐχθρούς in 79 (so Schneidewin²), or from the replacement of ἐν + dative by εἰς + accusative in the spoken language (began in the *Koine* and firmly established long before our manuscripts: cf. Browning (1983) 36–7).

81 μεμνηνός· ἄνδρα περιφανῶς ὀκνεῖς ἰδεῖν; ‘Are you afraid to see a man manifestly mad?’

82 φρονοῦντα γάρ νιν οὐκ ἂν ἐξέστην ὀκνῶ. ‘Yes, for I would not have shrunk in fear from him in his right mind.’ ἐξίσταμαι takes an accusative: cf. Dem. 18.319 οὐδένα ἐξίσταμαι (‘I yield to no one’) with Wankel, Åzelius (1897) 49, Moorhouse 37; also ἀποδιδράσκω at 167, perhaps modelled on φεύγω (cf. Moorhouse 37, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀποδιδράσκω 2). For φρονέω opposed to madness cf. Eur. *Med.* 1129, *Hel.* 575, *Ba.* 850–1. For passages in dialogue where ‘after one speaker has made a statement (or asked a question which suggests its own answer), another speaker supports his implied assent by a γάρ clause: “Yes, for”: “No, for”’ (Denniston 73) cf. 593, 1357.

The variant γάρ τᾶν prompted the conjecture τᾶν νιν (Blaydes¹ p. 311; τοί νιν *iam* Heimsoeth (1865) 89), which would mean ‘I tell you, I would not have . . .’, with τοί ‘revealing the speaker’s emotional or intellectual state’ (Denniston 541–2). But the forcefulness of the particle probably disqualifies it. Ll-J/W (*ST*) reject the transmitted text on the ground that ‘Odysseus can hardly be saying that he is afraid to look on Ajax mad *because* he would not have been afraid to look upon him sane’, and advocate γ’ ἂν νιν (*coni.* Blaydes¹), translating ‘Yes! When he was sane, I would not . . .’ But that takes too literal a view of the γάρ, which could be understood along the lines of ‘Yes, you correctly diagnose the nature of my apprehension, since if he were sane I would not fear him.’

The minority variant ἰδεῖν displaces ὀκνῶ through *error Wattianus* (*El.* 1232–3n.); the scribe repeats ἰδεῖν instead of ὀκνῶ from the end of the preceding line.

83 ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ νῦν σε μὴ παρόντ’ ἴδῃ πέλας. ‘But now he will not even see that you are nearby.’ Athena says what will happen; the delayed explanation for the paradoxical claim maintains narrative momentum.

84 πῶς, εἴπερ ὁφθαλμοῖς γε τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὀρᾷ; ‘How, if he sees with the same eyes?’ For the combination εἴπερ . . . γε ‘in a response to another’s words, where it qualifies the acceptance or correction of those words as precisely as possible’ see *El.* 1216n., Wakker (1994) 324.

85 ἐγὼ σκοτώσω βλέφαρα καὶ δεδορκότα. ‘I will plunge his eyes in darkness even though they see.’ For the concept of vision implied by this line see 69–70n. The paradox is sharper with δεδορκότα, so that the eyes are both darkened and

seeing, than with *δεδορκότος* (Markland (pre-1776)) or *δεδορκότι* (Valckenaer (1743–6) 6 verso).

86 *γένοιτο μέντ᾽αν πᾶν θεοῦ τεχνωμένου*. ‘Indeed, anything can happen when a god contrives it.’ For the idea that the gods can do all things cf. Eur. fr. 800 *TrGF* and the related notion that a god does things ‘easily’ (West on Hes. *Op.* 5, Davies (1979) 205). *μέντοι* is assentient (Denniston 401). The crasis *μέντ᾽αν* is not certainly paralleled in tragedy (*Ant.* 687 *γένοιτο μέντ᾽αν* *χάτέρῳ* *καλῶς ἔχον* is deleted by Heimreich, probably rightly; Diggle (1974) 6 = (1994) 95 conjectures the phrase at Eur. *Her.* 95, though see Renehan (1985) 146–7), but is found in prose (cf. Dem. 18.210 etc.).

87 *σίγα νυν ἑστῶς καὶ μέν ὥς κυρεῖς ἔχων*. ‘Then stand in silence and remain as you are’ (Lloyd-Jones).

88 *μένοιμ ᾗν*. ‘I will stay.’ The first person optative with *ᾗν* ‘signifies that the speaker, whatever his own inclinations, is consenting to a course which somebody else desires’ (Lattimore (1979) 211; cf. 186 (n.), *Ant.* 1108, *OR* 95, Moorhouse 230. Jebb’s ‘I must stay’ (*prob.* Pritchett (1955) 14) is mistaken, as is his similar interpretation of *Ant.* 1108 (‘expressing a fixed resolve’).

ἤθελον δ᾽ ᾗν ἐκτὸς ὧν τυχεῖν. ‘But I would rather be out of the way.’ Even with Athena’s explicit assurance Odysseus is still unwilling. *κυρεῖν* in **r** is an error (or conjecture) arising from 87.

According to Garvie, ‘at this point Odysseus probably withdraws to the end of the stage, where he is invisible to Ajax’. But Athena has only just made clear that she will prevent Ajax from seeing him by affecting his sight. A withdrawal by Odysseus would only confuse, by contradicting the *stichomythia* as a whole and this line in particular.

89–117 At last Ajax speaks for himself, in an exchange with Athena which shares characteristics with her conversation with Odysseus. After an initial question from the goddess (polite to Odysseus, brusque to Ajax), each man hails her and describes what he is up to: Odysseus is tracking Ajax, Ajax (he believes) is torturing Odysseus. But while Odysseus, aware of the limitations of his knowledge, goes on to solicit information from Athena, Ajax is too sure of himself to request advice. Odysseus stresses his obedience (34–5), even in the face of personal danger (88); Ajax, while thanking her for (what he believes to be) her assistance (91–3), pointedly ignores her one command (112–13). The audience are aware that the protagonist is currently delusional, and this will complicate their first impressions; pity will feature among their reactions (cf. 121–6), as he giddily proclaims his joy to such a mighty foe. But this delusion is the consequence of a crime planned, and nearly executed, when he was in his right mind; is his ghoulish delight in the fate of his victims merely a function of his madness?

89–90 ὦ οὗτος, Αἴας· δεύτερόν σε προσκαλῶ. | τί βαιὸν οὕτως ἐντρέπη τῆς συμμάχου; ‘You there, Ajax! I call you a second time. Why do you show so little concern for your ally?’ Athena’s repeated command (cf. Mastronarde (1979) 105–7), and description of herself as Ajax’s σύμμαχος, reveal her ‘attitude of dreadful playfulness’ towards him (*ibid.* 29); the latter is picked up by Ajax in his closing address (116–17n.).

For οὗτος in address see 71–2n. Αἴας is the minority reading; most witnesses have Αἴαν, the Homeric vocative. Elsewhere (289, 482, 525, 529, 923, 1015, 1269) Αἴας is overwhelmingly the majority reading, with Αἴαν confined to the *Suda* (where available) and the odd manuscript. At 89, 289, 529, 923, and 1015 metre allows either form, but at 482, 525, and 1269 Αἴας is metrically guaranteed. As S. probably did not use different forms in the same play, we should print Αἴας throughout. Αἴαν will be a Homeric reminiscence or a deliberate Homerisation; we cannot tell why it took root so strongly in 89 but barely elsewhere. See further Schulze (1924) 243–4 = (1934) 85–6.

Choeroboscus 105.15–16, 111.2–5, 262.20–2 (1 131.14–15, 135.31–3, 254.23–5 Hilgard) and Gregory of Corinth *De Dial. Att.* 53 (pp. 116–18 Schaefer) quote Αἴας here as evidence that it was the correct Attic form. Choeroboscus 162.34–163.2, 191.2–4, and 204.30–2 (1 176.30–2, 198.23–5, 209.10–12) does the same (without reference to *Aj.* 89), as does Eustathius 1469.59 (1 129.39–40 Stallbaum), who does mention S., as well as the name Xanthias in Aristophanes. (Editors wrongly claim that ‘Theodosius 131.14’ makes the same point. This is a false reference for ‘Choeroboscus 105.15–16 (1 131.14–15 Hilgard)’, where Ch. *corrects* Th. 975.10–17 (1 3.10–13 H.).) On the secondary tradition here see further Dawe, *STS* 1 100–1.

91–3 Ajax’s opening speech is at variance with his character as revealed later in the play. A man who will later express profound hostility to the gods begins with a statement of hyperbolic gratitude to a deity. A man who will be memorably reminded of the duties of χάρις begins with an extravagant promise of fulfilling χάρις. A man whose typical form of speech will be the monologue, the soliloquy, begins with an enthusiastic address of his interlocutor. Such is the effect of the goddess’s power.

91 Ajax enters from the skene. Scholars often furnish Ajax with a whip, but the bare mention of such a weapon at 110, without a demonstrative or even an article, would be surprising if he had one in his hand. The same objection applies to the suggestion by Taplin (1978) 85, 188 n. 7 that Ajax is carrying a sword, since Athena refers simply to his ἔγχος (95; contrast 658 κρύψω τόδ’ ἔγχος τοῦμόν). Taplin’s staging would also ‘blunt the effect of the sword’s appearance at 646’ (M. Heath (1987) 168 n. 7; see further his discussion). The ancient title of the play, Αἴας Μαστιγοφόρος, provides evidence for fourth-century performance practice (see n. on the Title); neither it nor the hypothesis

(which states that Ajax εἰσέρχεται ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ μαστιγιῶν τὸν Ὀδυσσεά, p. 9.18–19 Chr.) tells us anything about the original production. But if it had not been coined, would anyone now assume that Ajax was carrying a whip?

ὦ χαῖρ' Ἀθάννα, χαῖρε Διογενὲς τέκνον 'O hail, Athena, hail, child of Zeus'. ὦ with the imperative is found in a variety of registers (*El.* 666n.). Repetition of χαῖρε conveys Ajax's excitement: 'the misplaced casualness of address shows us at once that something is terribly wrong' (MD). διογενής is an exclusively human epithet in early epic; in tragedy it can apply to all the gods together (see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 631), but when used of an individual, it is usually Athena (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 129, Eur. *Tro.* 526, *Cycl.* 350, *Hel.* 25).

92 ὥς εὖ παρέστης: 'How well you have stood by me!' Indeed she has, to frustrate his plans and reveal his disgrace. παρίσταμαι frequently denotes divine assistance (cf. 117, Tr. Adesp. fr. 527 *TrGF*, Archil. fr. 94.1–2 *IEG*, Leon. Tar. *A.P.* 6.188.5 = 1976 *HE*, West (1997) 224; also 741–2n. on παρών), often Athena's for Odysseus (cf. Hom. *Il.* 10.278–9, 23.783–4, *Od.* 3.218–22, 4.826–8, 13.300–1, 13.387–9, Tr. Adesp. fr. 672a.22 *TrGF* at v/2 p. 1144). For gods 'standing near' their protégés cf. 774–5, Hom. *Il.* 5.185–6 οὐχ ὁ γ' ἀνευθε θεοῦ τὰδε μαίνεται, ἀλλὰ τις ἄγχι | ἔστηκ' ἀθανάτων.

92–3 καί σε παγχρύσοις ἐγὼ | στέψω λαφύροις τῆσδε τῆς ἀγρας χάριν. 'I will honour you with golden spoils in thanks for this quarry.' In fact Ajax is the quarry, thanks to his destruction of spoils intended for the army. Gold is the metal most associated with the gods (847, *El.* 510n., adding Costa (1984) 32–44, West (2007) 153–4) and the most precious offering made to them. For στέψω (literally 'crown') of religious offerings see *El.* 53n. Although Ajax says σε, the act referred to by στέψω will be the decoration of a statue; for the conflation of deity and image see Renehan (1987) 241 (on Call. *Hym.* 5.1).

94 καλῶς ἔλεξας. 'Thank you.' As Quincey (1966) 143 says, 'Athena is evidently not simply praising Ajax but thanking him for the promise of a portion of the spoil', comparing Eur. *Alc.* 1104, *Hipp.* 715. For καλῶς with λέγω and related expressions denoting approval or gratitude see Stevens (1976) 54–5.

ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνό μοι φράσσον 'But tell me this'. For ἐκεῖνο anticipating and introducing a new point cf. *Phil.* 310–11 ἐκεῖνο δ' οὐδεῖς, ἥνίκ' ἄν μνησθῶ, θέλει, | σῶσαι μ' ἔς οἴκους.

95 ἔβαψας ἔγχος εὖ πρὸς Ἀργείων στρατῷ: 'Have you dipped your sword thoroughly in the Argive army?' For βάπτω of piercing flesh with a weapon cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1577–8 φάσσανον εἶσω | σαρκὸς ἔβαψεν, [Aesch.] *PV* 863 δῖθηκτον ἐν σφαγῇσι βάψασα ξίφος. For ἔγχος 'sword' cf. 287, 658, 907, Eur. *El.* 696, *Phoen.* 1413, Kugler (1905) 13; it can also mean 'weapon' (cf. Pearson on fr. 781). For πρὸς equivalent to ἐν cf. *Tr.* 371–2 ταῦτα πολλοὶ πρὸς μέσῃ Τραχινίων | ἄγορᾷ συνεξήκουον (with 423–4 ἐν μέσῃ Τραχινίων | ἄγορᾷ πολὺς σου

ταῦτά γ' εἰσήκουσ' ὄχλος), Aesch. *Sept.* 210 νεὼς καμουύσης ποντίῳ πρὸς κύματι (where the variant ἐν will reflect the intrusion of a gloss: 28n.); MLW compares German 'an'. The regular senses of πρὸς, 'on', 'at', or 'upon' are all inappropriate.

96 κόμπος πάρεστι κοῦκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι τὸ μῆ. 'The boast is there, and I do not deny it.' For the emphatic formulation 'I say it and do not deny it' cf. *Ant.* 443, *Eur. El.* 1057. Instead of μῆ the *Suda* (μ 967 = III 388.17 Adler) reads μὴ οὐχί in its lemma and paraphrase (though not in its quotation of the line), as does a periphrasis in the scholia to L; this is not enough to tip the scales in favour of μῆ οὐ (*coni.* Hermann (1808) 221 = (1827) 235). In comparable expressions in S. μὴ οὐ is the sole or dominant reading in the following list, where * marks places where οὐ has dropped out in at least one manuscript (being apparently hypermetric), + places where the relevant text is at the end of a line: *Aj.* *540, *728, *Tr.* *622, *Ant.* 97, +544, 936, *El.* 107, *133, *OR* *13, 221, *283, 1065, 1090/1, +1232, *OC* *566. Of these, *OR* 221 (μὴ οὐκ ἔχων) is metrically guaranteed. μῆ alone is attested at *Tr.* 90, 226, 742, *Ant.* 443, *OR* 1388, *Phil.* 349. Of these, *OR* 1388 (τὸ μῆ ἀποκλήσαι) is metrically guaranteed. Since both types are certain for S. (and also for Aeschylus and Euripides), the least bad option is to print the best attested reading each time. See further Moorhouse (1940), Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1171 (III 533 n. 3), Denniston and Page on *id.* 1169–71 (correcting Fraenkel).

97 ἦ καὶ πρὸς Ἀτρεΐδαισιν ἥχμασας χέρα; 'Did you really turn your armed hand against the Atridae?' ἦ καὶ indicates excitement and incredulity (38n.). In place of ἥχμασας Reiske (1753) 1 conjectures ἥμαξας (cf. 453), now found as a gloss above ἔβαψας (95) in a few manuscripts; cf. the gloss ἡμάτωσας above the verb in this line. But 'the well-known spirit of hardy experiment which characterises Sophocles' use of noun + verb combinations... is a sufficient protection for the traditional text' (Dawe, *STS* I 130, citing 1287 ἄλμα κουφιεῖν; cf. *Tr.* 355 αἰχμάσαι τάδε 'to perform these feats of arms', 450–3n.). There are minority variants χέρῃ (perhaps, as MLW suggests, from χέραᾶ, reflecting unease over αἰχμάζω with χέρα as its object) and χέρας (cf. 40n.).

98 ὥστ' οὐποτ' Αἴανθ' οἶδ' ἀτιμάσουσ' ἔτι. 'So that never again shall they refuse honour to Ajax' (Lloyd-Jones). Ajax's use of his own name conveys his 'emphatic self-assertion' (Kelly (2007) 85; cf. 864, *OR* 7–8, West on Hes. *Th.* 22, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.7.27).

Q's ὥς was conjectured by Porson (pre-1808a) 182. Elmsley (1814) 352 concurs, arguing that 'in the answer to a question, ὥς is used to confirm some assertion which has been made before'; he compares 39, where, as here, the ὥς statement follows a question beginning ἦ καὶ. Hermann¹ counters 'verum

ῥοτε, quod est *adeo ut*, multo fortius est.’ For the corruption cf. 727 and (in both directions) Diggle (1981a) 8.

Both οἶδ’ and οἶδε were known in antiquity (Σ p. 38 Chr.) and are found in the manuscripts; ‘at tranquillius est istud οἶδα, οἶδε contra fortius, et plenum acerbitatis’ (Hermann¹). ὅδε can denote someone not visible to the speaker (77n.), but may be deictic: ‘Ajax thinks he has got them right behind him in his hut’ (MLW). Brunck (II/2 163) suggests ὥδ’, comparing 448–9; but there ὥδε looks backwards to the Judgment of the Arms, which Ajax has just been discussing. Here this has yet to be mentioned, and so the force would be obscure.

99 τεθνᾶσιν ἄνδρες, ὥς τὸ σὸν ξυνῆκ’ ἐγώ. ‘The men are dead, as I understand your remark.’ Brunck restores ἄνδρες for manuscript ἄνδρες (9–10n.). For the instantaneous aorist cf. 536, 790, *El.* 668n.

100 θανόντες ἤδη τὰμ’ ἀφαιρείσθων ὅπλα. ‘Now that they are dead let them take away my weapons!’ Cf. 447–9, *Phil.* 374–6 (Neoptolemus) ἤρασσον κακοῖς | τοῖς πᾶσιν . . . | εἰ τὰμὰ κείνος ὅπλ’ ἀφαιρήσοιτό με, 383 τῶν ἐμῶν τητῶμενος.

101 For εἶν’ introducing a transition to a fresh point by a backward glance at what has been established: “So far so good, (and now . . .)” (Stevens (1976) 34) see *El.* 534n., adding A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 407–9. The correct aspiration (S–D II 557, Ap. Dysc. *Synt.* 320b = II/2 458.12 Schneider and Uhlig) is found only in L (cf. *OC* 476 and probably *El.* 534; not, however, at *OC* 1308 or *Phil.* 1308), a manuscript whose accentuation is often likely to reflect ancient (although post-Sophoclean) grammatical tradition (Pind. *P.* 11.35n.). S. fr. 555b.10 *TrGF* has the aspirate in a papyrus of the 2nd–3rd centuries AD.

101–2 τί γὰρ δὴ παῖς ὁ τοῦ Λαερτίου; | ποῦ σοι τύχης ἔστηκεν; ‘What then of the son of Laertes? What is his situation?’ For a verbless question followed by a supplementary question with a verb cf. 983–4, Diggle (1994) 428–9. For γὰρ introducing a question where the speaker ‘having been satisfied on one subject, wishes to learn something further’ (Denniston 81; his categories (i) and (ii) on pp. 82–3 should perhaps be merged) cf. 282, 1348. δὴ reinforces γὰρ (Denniston 244). For the different forms of the name Laertes see 1–2n. For the partitive genitive τύχης see *El.* 390n.

102 ἢ πέφυγέ σε; ‘Or has he escaped you?’ ‘The innocent seeming question is calculated to touch Ajax on the raw, as his response immediately reveals’ (MD). The taunt works better with ἦ than ἦ (so rightly Elmsley on *OC* 66). When Athena asks ‘What about Odysseus?’ the context suggests that she means ‘What have you done to him?’; she now raises an alternative possibility, that he has escaped, which requires the disjunctive. For other textual decisions involving these words cf. 176, 342, Ellendt 302.

103 ἢ τοῦπίτριπτον κίναδος ἐξήρου μ' ὄπου; 'Did you ask me where that wretched scoundrel is?' Ajax's counter-question indicates his contempt for Odysseus (Mastronarde (1979) 38). For ἢ forcefully introducing an inquiry see Denniston 282–3. ἐπίτριπτος is literally 'one who deserves to be crushed' (Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 557–9); the usage is almost exclusively comic (cf. Ar. *Plut.* 275, 598, Alexis fr. 110.1 *PCG*, and ἐπιτριβείης, 'a common, colloquial curse': A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 556–7). κίναδος is a term of abuse found chiefly in comedy and oratory (see Wankel on Dem. 18.162, Gow on Theocr. 5.25). Scholiasts and lexicographers assert that it is a Sicilian word for fox (cf. Willi (2008) 37 with n. 45, and Davies (1985) 36 with n. 25 on animal names in invective). For the combination cf. Ar. *Nub.* 447–8 περίτριμμα δικῶν, | κύρβις, κρόταλον, κίναδος, *Az.* 429–30 (cited 381n.), Andoc. 1.99 ὃ συκοφάντα καὶ ἐπίτριπτον κίναδος. For the absence of a verb in a relative clause see 31–3n.

104 ἔγωγ'. 'Yes, I do.' For ἐγώ, ἔγωγε as responses to questions cf. 678, 1347, 1365, *Ti.* 1248, K–G II 539–40, Bruhn §197.iii. The minority variant ἐγώ δ' is found in Zonaras II 1448 Tittmann s.v. ὁμοκλή (first half of the 13th century: cf. Dickey (2007) 102) and four (later) manuscripts; for the error (perhaps caused by ignorance of the idiom) cf. 678. Deleting the point after ἔγωγε (thus Bothe²) gives a purposeless emphasis to the pronoun.

Ὀδυσσέα τὸν σὸν ἐνστάτην λέγω. 'I mean Odysseus, your enemy.' Synzesis of –εα is unexceptionable (Diggle (1984b) 67 = (1994) 314 cites examples). For λέγω 'I mean' cf. 569, 1228, LSJ⁹ s.v. III 9a; 'it is psychologically appropriate that in none of Ajax's references to his enemy does he directly *name* Odysseus' (MD). ἐνστάτης is a classical *hapax*, but ἐνίστημι can mean 'oppose' (LSJ⁹ s.v. B IV 1).

105–6 ἡδιστος, ὦ δέσποινα, δεσμώτης ἔσω | θακεῖ· θανεῖν γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ τί πω θέλω. 'Mistress, he sits inside, a most welcome prisoner. I do not want him to die yet.' This sense of ἡδιστος (*El.* 929n., adding Stinton (1976) 132 = (1990) 213) is ironically applicable only to Ajax's viewpoint, and paradoxical in combination with δεσμώτης. For ὦ δέσποινα addressing Athena see 38n. (although, unlike Odysseus, Ajax does not add φίλη). θακεῖ is Attic, θωκεῖ non-Attic (Pind. *P.* 11.6n.).

107 πρὶν ἂν τί δράσης ἢ τί κερδάνης πλέον; 'Until you do what, or gain what further advantage?' For questions in which 'speaker A's utterance is suspended while speaker B encourages A to finish what he has to say' cf. Eur. *Med.* 679–71, Mastronarde (1979) 56–7; also (for τί δοῶς; in such questions) Diggle (1994) 501 n. 37.

108 πρὶν ἂν δεθῇς πρὸς κίον' ἑρκείου στέγης— 'Not until he has been bound to a pillar of my dwelling. . . .' (Moorhouse 254, adapted). Binding to a pillar followed by whipping is the sort of punishment more naturally meted out to

a slave: cf. 239–42, Bond on Eur. *Her.* 1011, Lys. fr. 279.4 Carey, Aeschin. 1.59, Ant. Thess. *A.Pl.* 197.1 = 573 *GP* παλάμας πρὸς κίονα διῆσεν, Satyrus *A.Pl.* 195.4 = 350 *FGE* χεῖρας ὑπὸ στιβαρῶ κίονι δησάμενος. In tragedy στέγη means ‘building’, not ‘roof’ (LL-J/W, *So.*, citing Aesch. *Cho.* 571, 653, and Eur. *Tro.* 483 for ἐρκεῖος ‘domesticus’).

ἐρκεῖου for transmitted ἐρκίου is owed to Burges (in his edition of Euripides’ *Troades*, p. 175), and might be in A. For the form see Finglass (2009g) 216–17.

109 τί δῆτα τὸν δύστηνον ἐργάσῃ κακόν; ‘What harm, then, will you do to the wretched man?’ Future indicative ἐργάσῃ is taken as an aorist subjunctive by Nauck⁸, who claims that the verb depends on πρὶν ἂν in 107. But Athena’s interruption can scarcely have a syntactic relationship with a previous interruption complete in itself; nor can it depend on Ajax’s πρὶν ἂν in 108, since δῆτα introducing the question (42n.) indicates a syntactic break. The aorist would require also δῆσας instead of δεθείς in 108 (thus Jebb). Contrast *OR* 559–60, where Creon’s interruption (which lacks a particle) and Oedipus’ continuation both fit the syntax established by Oedipus’ interrupted utterance in 558.

110 μάστιγι πρῶτον νῶτα φοινιχθεὶς θάνῃ. ‘... and has first had his back whipped crimson before he dies’ (Moorhouse 254, adapted). The burden of the utterance lies in the participles, not the verb, which repeats the idea of dying from 106. Similar reasons lie behind the supposed tautologies of *Phil.* 1329–35 (‘You will not be cured, until you come to Troy and are cured’) and *Tk.* 1129–33 (‘She killed herself.’ ‘I wish I had killed her first!’)

111 μὴ δῆτα τὸν δύστηνον ὥδέ γ’ ἄκισθ. ‘Now don’t torture the poor man like that.’ Athena does not ask Ajax not to hurt Odysseus, only to avoid maltreating him with the violence which he has just described (ὥδέ γ’). For μὴ δῆτα in ‘passionate negative commands or wishes’ see Denniston 276. For the orthography of ἄκισθ see 65n.

Wolf’s δέιλαιον for δύστηνον (in his first edition, p. 140) supposes an error found (in one direction or the other) at 1000 (n.). δύστηνον could have been erroneously introduced from 109, where also it is preceded by δῆτα τόν. But the repetition is less suspicious in an ancient work than it would be in a modern (cf. *El.* 335–6n.).

112–13 χαίρειν, Ἀθάνᾱ, τὰλλ’ ἐγὼ σ’ ἐφίεμαι, | κείνος δὲ τείσει τήνδε κοῦκ ἄλλην δίκην. ‘In other things I bid you rejoice, Athena: but the man will pay this penalty and no other.’ Ajax’s (politely expressed) refusal foreshadows his more arrogant rejection of the goddess’s assistance described by Calchas (770–7; cf. De Jong (2006) 82 n. 26).

Colloquial χαίρειν σε κλεῦω usually means ‘I greet you/bid you farewell’ (examples at Headlam on Aesch. *Ag.* 577) or even (often with πολλὰ) ‘I tell you

to get lost' (cf. Stevens (1976) 26, supplemented by Collard (2005a) 362). But at *El.* 1456 πολλὰ χαίρειν μ' εἶπας 'Your words have given me much cause for rejoicing' the verb retains its literal sense; compare how Eur. *Med.* 756 χαίρων πορεύου, formally equivalent to χαίρων ἴθι ('get lost' at *Suppl.* 248, *Phoen.* 921) means 'Go on your way with joy!' (Kovacs; cf. Laks (1982) 217). The sense in our passage is encouraged by the strong opposition between the two lines: Athena will be grieved by Ajax's refusal, and the polar opposite of that is χαίρειν (554–5n.). It makes rhetorical sense for Ajax to refer to Athena's positive emotion.

ἐφίεμαι introducing a request in S. means 'order' or 'command', never 'ask' (cf. 795, 991, *Tr.* 286, *OR* 766, 1055, *El.* 51, 1111, *Phil.* 770). It is thus a remarkably strong verb for a mortal to use to a deity; and Ajax uses it twice (116), emphasising his 'misplaced sense of confidence' (MD). προϋνέπω (Blaydes¹, presumably taking ἐφίεμαι as an intrusion from 116; cf. *Tr.* 227 χαίρειν δὲ τὸν κήρυκα προϋνέπω) abolishes this nuance. ἐφίεμαι 'order' usually takes the dative (as in 116), but for the accusative see in general K–G II 26–7 and in particular *Phil.* 770–2 ἐφίεμαι | ἐκόντα μήτ' ἄκοντα μήτε τῷ τέχνῃ | κείνοις μεθεῖναι ταῦτα (which Dawe, *STS* I 131, unconvincingly attempts to show is a special case).

In place of ἐγὼ σ' F. Schmidt (1862) 17 n. 10 conjectures ἐγὼ γ', arguing that σε crept in under the influence of the set phrase χαίρειν σε κελεύω, which then lost –γε in some manuscripts through a metrical correction. Independently making the same proposal, J. Jackson (1955) 155–6 translates 'The rest of them may go hang, but this one shall have his due'. This removes the unusual construction of ἐφίεμαι and sense of χαίρειν. But it would require not τᾶλλα (cf. Eur. fr. 468 *TrGF* τὰ δ' ἄλλα χαῖρε κύλικος ἐρπούσης κύκλω, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 1014–15), but τοὺς ἄλλους (as in Plut. *Pyrrh.* 16.13, cited by Jackson). Moreover, the sense proposed by Jackson is undesirable. Ajax is not disclaiming revenge on others; he has only just acknowledged his attack on the army (95–6) and the Atreidae (97–100). And the issue at stake is no longer the relative punishments of the army and their leaders, but the scope of Ajax's obedience. The erroneous γ' in some manuscripts might have migrated from the line above.

τείσει for transmitted τίσει is owed to Nauck⁸ p. 183; for the change see *El.* 115n. Herwerden (1880) 66 first notes the inscriptional evidence for this.

114–15 σὺ δ' οὖν, ἐπειδὴ τέρψις ἦδε σοὶ τὸ δρᾶν, | χρῶ χεῖρί, φείδου μηδὲν ὦνπερ ἐννοεῖς. 'Well then, since it is your pleasure to do this, use your hand, do not hold back from what you intend.' Athena's affability after Ajax's defiance is ominous; the audience will wonder what she is really intending. With δ' οὖν 'the speaker waives any objection that he has . . . to something being done, or contemplated, by another person . . . The particles are almost invariably

preceded by σύ or ό (ή, οί), and the expression nearly always forms the opening of a speech' (Denniston 466); cf. 961. τέρψις ἦδε is followed by the epexegetic articular infinitive τὸ δρᾶν (literally 'since this is your pleasure, to do it'); the variant ὦδε for ἦδε looks like an intrusive gloss (28n.). For the vigorous asyndeton of the imperatives cf. Aesch. fr. 332 *TrGF* ἔλα, δίωκε μή τι [Wagner: ἐλλαδίῳ κεκμηῆτι codd.] μαλκίων ποδί. The γράφεται-variant in LK ἐννέπεις for ἐννοεῖς is perhaps a pedantic 'correction' made on the ground that Athena refers to Ajax's words, not his thoughts (see 34–5n. for another change made on a similar principle).

J. Jackson (1955) 156–7 adjusts 114 to give οὐκοῦν, ἐπειδὴ τέρψις ἦδ', ἐν σοὶ τὸ δρᾶν (for ἐν σοὶ 'it is in your power' see Collard (2005a) 375), but without indicating his objection to the paradoxos. Ll-J/W print ἦδ', ἐν while keeping σύ δ' unchanged; but the resulting sense 'Well then, you – since this is your pleasure, the action is in your power –', with its anacoluthon (for which Ll-J/W (*So.*) cite only a passage from comedy, Ar. *Ran.* 31–2), is clumsy.

For φείδου μηδὲν ὥνπερ ἐννοεῖς cf. Eur. *Med.* 401 φείδου μηδὲν ὥν ἐπίστασαι, *Hec.* 1044, *Her.* 1400, Ar. *Av.* 987; also 843–4n.

116 χωρῶ πρὸς ἔργον. 'I go to my task.' Ajax 'goes back to his butcher's work with evident gusto: . . . "Back to work"' (Knox (1961) 5 = (1979) 129). Knox *ibid.* 30 n. 25 = 153 n. 25 compares Thuc. 3.83.3 πρὸς τὰ ἔργα ἐχώρουν (also of violence, also marking a change from λόγοι); cf. Eur. fr. 223.81 *TrGF* καὶ δὴ [πρὸς ἔργω]! τῶν νεανιῶν χέρες, fr. 773.31–2 εἰς ἔργα κυναγοὶ στείχουσιν θηροφόνου, Stevens (1976) 39–40.

116–17 τοῦτο σοὶ δ' ἐφίεμαι, | τοιάνδ' αἶε μοι σύμμαχον παρεστάναι. 'But I bid you this – that you always stand as such an ally beside me!' This is 'an easy request for Athena to answer: she will indeed remain the same kind of ally she is now, viz. no ally at all' (AHS). For the plea for the god's 'alliance' cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 2, 19, Archil. fr. 108 *IEG* κλύθ' ἀναξ' Ἠφαιστε, καὶ μοι σύμμαχος γουνουμένω | Ἰλαος γενέο, Sappho fr. 1.27–8 Voigt σύ δ' αὖτα | σύμμαχος ἔσσο, Wilkins on Eur. *Held.* 766. Repetition of σύμμαχος from Athena's earlier utterance (90; cf. the repetition of παρεστάναι from 92) rounds off the exchange and emphasises the characters' differing perspectives: what is sarcastic in Athena's mouth is confident and condescending in Ajax's.

For δέ preceded by two words cf. 169 (*coni.*), 1419, Denniston 187–8; Bergk's σοὶ δέ τοῦτ' (his edition, p. liii) is not required. For ἐφίεμαι see 112–13n.

Ajax leaves via the skene.

118–33 The coda to the prologue provides an unexpectedly favourable perspective on Ajax, from two figures who are no friends of his, one of whom has just received a serious slight at his hands (112–13n.). Athena's acknowledgement of Ajax's former qualities and Odysseus' pity for his present state make

an effective transition into the rest of the play, where the chorus, Tecmessa, and then Teucer present a more positive picture of the protagonist. This will appear more credible in the light of the views of Ajax's avowed enemies. Furthermore, Athena's warnings that arrogance against the gods will be punished, and that a day is enough to change human affairs, will gain new significance in the context of Calchas' speech (131–2n.), while Odysseus' pity for Ajax prefigures his later intervention on his behalf (1316–73n.). In each case the connexion is established retrospectively; nothing yet suggests that these remarks will be of more than local significance.

118 ὁρᾷς, Ὀδυσσεῦ, τὴν θεῶν ἰσχὺν ὄση; 'Do you see, Odysseus, how great is the power of the gods?' For the 'elliptic indirect question following the proleptic noun' see Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 102; also 31–3n. The vocative is appropriate in the context of 'pointing a moral', as at Hor. *C.* 1.7.19. The line need not be a question, as a gloss in C reminds us (γράφεται καὶ ἀποφαντικῶς), and Dawe (*STS* 1 131, following Brunck) prefers 'a majestic statement by one who has demonstrated her powers'. This is too detached: Athena eagerly interacts with Odysseus and urges on him the significance of what he has seen.

119–20 τοῦτου τίς ἂν σοι τάνδρὸς ἢ προνούστερος | ἢ δρᾶν ἀμείνων ἡνρέθη τὰ καίρια; 'Who, I ask you, could have been found more farsighted than this man, or better at doing what was right?' For all its wider significance (118–33n.), this statement does not mark generosity of spirit in Athena: rather, the greater Ajax was, the worse his fall and the mightier his opponent. 'Farsightedness' is not often associated with Ajax, but cf. Hector's compliment at Hom. *Il.* 7.288–9 Αἶαν, ἔπει τοι δῶκε θεὸς μέγεθός τε βίην τε | καὶ πινυτήν ('wisdom') and Philostratus' description of him as φρόνημα αἴρων εὐήνιον τε καὶ σῶφρον (*Her.* 35.2). Thucydides admires the same virtue in Themistocles (1.138.3 τῶν μελλόντων ἐπὶ πλείστον τοῦ γενησομένου ἄριστος εἰκαστής), while Ajax later approves it in Tecmessa (536). My preferred sense of καίριος (cf. *El.* 228, Race (1981) 209) provides a better contrast with Ajax's current actions than a temporal reference ('what the circumstances demanded'; cf. Race (1981) 211–12). The combination of intellectual and physical activity as the mark of good men perhaps recalls the Homeric μύθων τε ῥητῆρ' ἔμεναι πρηκτῆρά τε ἔργων (*Il.* 9.443); cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.510–16, Dover (1974) 161.

The minority variant ἄνδρῶν ἄλλος (for ἂν σοι τάνδρὸς) shows simplification of syntax. Desire for a main verb in the first clause led to ἦ in 119 becoming ἦν in many manuscripts, and to Wakefield (1792) 63 proposing ἦν for ἂν. But it would be a shame to lose repeated ἦ (which emphasises Ajax's twofold ability) or potential ἂν (as no search is attempted). ἡνρέθη for transmitted εὐρέθη is owed to Dindorf³, as also at 616/17, 763, 1023, 1054, 1135 (see *El.* 1093n., adding Wecklein (1869) 33, Arnott on Alexis fr. 9.2 *PCG*).

121–6 Odysseus’ response expresses the communality of suffering between enemies, the *locus classicus* for which occurs in the meeting between Achilles and Priam in *Iliad* 24. ‘Enmity is compatible with the kind of pity that Odysseus displays, because human antagonists are always united at a more fundamental level by their shared humanity’; his reaction ‘does not imply an “abandonment” of the traditional ethic <of hating enemies>, but on the contrary is in the fullest accord with its ideals’ (M. Heath (1987) 169). See further *OC* 560–8, Eur. *Hec.* 282–5, 340–1, Rutherford (1982) 158–9 = Cairns (2001) 286–7, Pelling (1997b) 16–17 n. 70, (2005) 292–3 with 310 n. 42. Odysseus’ reaction is especially profound since he is pitying a man ‘who at that very moment is showing no pity to the captive he believes is Odysseus (105–6)’ (Johnson and Clapp (2005) 127, noting also (p. 128) the contempt for pity that Ajax will show at 580). According to Buxton (2006) 16, ‘the vista momentarily opened up by these observations is clouded by their grounding in self-interest’. Rather, ancient expressions of pity are often unashamedly linked to the thought that the onlooker might one day suffer in a similar fashion, however self-centred this may seem to a modern (cf. 1365–7). It is especially appropriate after Athena’s words that Odysseus should show enough *πρόνοια* to imagine that he could be reduced to Ajax’s level; previously, his focus was on his personal safety (74–88n.). His words are no rebuke of Athena; he is a man, and a different moral standard applies.

121–2 ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδέν’ οἶδ’ ἐποικτίρω δέ νιν | δύστηνον ἔμπας, καίπερ ὄντα δυσμενῇ ‘I know of no one. But I pity the wretched man none the less, even though he is an enemy.’ For Ajax’s enmity towards Odysseus see 78n. The two adjectives frame the line, suggesting the opposing reactions which Ajax stirs in Odysseus.

ἐποικτίρω is owed to Nauck⁸ for transmitted ἐποικτεῖρω (also 510, 652); for the orthography see Threatte π 648. Herwerden (1882) 86 makes the same recommendation, albeit generally and without reference to specific passages. ἔμπας for transmitted ἔμπης is owed to Wesseling (1751) 24, who takes it from the scholia, which say that ἔμπας(ς) is Attic, ἔμπης Ionic (p. 43 Chr.); cf. 1338, where the manuscripts are split. For the correct vocalism see Björck (1950) 123–4, 236.

123 ὁθούνεκ’ ἄτη συγκατέζευκται κακῇ ‘because he is yoked to terrible ruin’. For the image see 24n.

124 οὐδὲν τὸ τούτου μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦμὸν σκοπῶν. ‘as I consider not so much his condition but my own.’ For the expression cf. Eur. fr. 757.888 *TrGF* οὐ τήνδε μᾶλ[λ]ον ἢ τὸ τῆς δ[ι]κῆς ὁ[ρ]ῶν.

125–6 ὁρῶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν | εἰδῶλ’ ὅσοιπερ ζῶμεν ἢ κοῦφην σκιάν. ‘For I see that all we who live are nothing but images or a light shadow.’ Shadow symbolises powerlessness and helplessness: cf. *Phil.* 946–7

κούκ οἷδ' ἐναίρων νεκρόν, ἥ καπνοῦ σκιάν, | εἰδωλὸν ἄλλως, fr. 945.2 *TrGF*
 ὡς οὐδέν ἐσμεν πλὴν σκιαῖς ἐοικότες, fr. 13 ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστὶ πνεῦμα καὶ σκιά
 μόνον (from *Locrian Ajax*, another play which describes Athena's anger against
 a mortal), *El.* 1159n., Aesch. fr. 154a.9 κακῶθεις δ' οὐδέν ἄλλ' εἰ[] μὴ σκιᾶ, Eur.
Med. 1224, Hom. *Od.* 10.455 τοὶ δὲ σκιάι ἀίσσουσιν, Pind. *P.* 8.95–6 σκιάς ὄναρ
 | ἀνθρῶπος, Ar. *Av.* 686, Dickie (1976) 9.

127–33 'Athena's interpretation is not wrong, nor is she criticized for it; but she reacts as a goddess, Odysseus with the sympathy of an enlightened man.' Thus R. Parker (1997) 152–3, rejecting the common scholarly practice (examples on p. 152 n. 34) of finding fault with Athena because her words do not explore every aspect of Ajax's condition. Sosiphanes of Syracuse (c. 300 BC) 92 F 3 *TrGF* evokes the same ideas: ὦ δυστυχεῖς μὲν πολλά, παῦρα δ' ὀλβιοὶ | βροτοί, τί σεμνύνεσθε ταῖς ἐξουσiais, | ὅς ἐν [Wagner: ἀν codd.] τ' ἔδωκε φέγγος ἐν τ' ἀφείλετο; | ἦν δ' εὐτυχῆτε μηδὲν ὄντες εὐθέως | ἴσ' οὐρανῷ φρονεῖτε, τὸν δὲ κύριον | Ἄιδην παρεστῶτ' οὐχ ὄρατε πλησίον.

127–9 τοιαῦτα τοίνυν εἰσορῶν ὑπέркоπον | μηδὲν ποτ' εἴπησ' αὐτὸς εἰς θεοὺς ἔπος; | μηδ' ὄγκον ἄρη μηδέν' 'Therefore, as you behold such things, do not yourself speak any arrogant word towards the gods, nor take on yourself any pomp.' Athena links her reflections closely to Odysseus'. If he pities Ajax, this must affect his own behaviour. αὐτός suggests that Ajax has committed the offence against which Athena warns, as will later be confirmed (762–77). For ἄρη see 75n.

129–30 εἴ τινας πλέον | ἥ χειρὶ βρίθεις ἢ μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει. 'if you are mightier than another either in power or the depth of great wealth'. The expression parallels *El.* 1090–2 ζώης μοι καθύπερθεν | χειρὶ καὶ πλούτῳ τεῶν ἐχθρῶν ὅσον | νῦν ὑπόχειρ ναίεις. In each passage wealth is not as immediately relevant as power, but it had its importance as a source of τιμῇ (*El.* 72n.). For μακρός used where length is not at issue cf. 825, Arnott on Alexis fr. 68.2 *PCG*. For the 'depth of wealth' cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 554 βαθύπλουτον χθόνα, Eur. fr. 453.1 *TrGF* Εἰρήνα βαθύπλουτε with Harder, 7.1 κρεῖσσον δὲ πλούτου καὶ βαθυσπόρου [v.l.] χθονός; also Gow on Theocr. 14.29. The minority variant βάρει is harder to parallel: at Eur. *El.* 1287 Diggle adopts Herwerden's πλούτου βάθος [βάρος cod.], while in Eur. *IT* 416 ὄλβου βάρος the noun is used because 'the physical weight of the treasure weighs down the ships' (Denniston on Eur. *El.* 1287). For corruption of βάθει to βάρει (here assisted by proximity to βρίθεις, literally 'you are heavy') see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 24.

131–2 ὥς ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν | ἅπαντα τάνθρώπεια: 'For a day causes all human affairs to decline and recover again.' The antithesis between raising people up and casting them down accompanies accounts of divine

power at Hes. *Op.* 5–6, Archil. fr. 130 *IEG*, Pind. *P.* 2.49–52. ἡμέρα stresses the weakness of man rather than the power of god: ‘human fortune is so fragile that it may undergo a complete reversal in a single day’ (Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 1689, with examples; add *El.* 1149n. and (MLW) Theogn. 160, Simon. fr. 244, 331 Poltera, Philemon fr. 178.11–12 *PCG*). But it also prefigures the idea of the ‘crucial day’, coextensive with Athena’s anger, on which Ajax must either perish or be saved (748–83n., Easterling (1993b) 82–4). Similarly, the verb ἀνάγει will turn out to be no mere filler in a polar expression (*El.* 305–6n.), but an indication of how Ajax’s fortunes will partially recover after death.

Bare ἡμέρα can be paralleled (cf. Theogn. 160, Prop. 3.18.16 *tot bona tam parvo clausit in orbe dies*), but ἥμαρ ἔν (Burges (1815) 245) may be right. ἔν is lost in a similar expression at Eur. fr. 549 *TrGF* ἅλλ’ ἥμαρ <έν> τοι μεταβολὰς πολλὰς ἔχει, where Kannicht compares Eur. *Hec.* 285 τὸν πάντα δ’ ὄλβον ἥμαρ ἔν μ’ ἀφείλετο, *Phoen.* 1689, fr. 420.2; add Sosiphanes Syrac. 92 F 3.3 *TrGF* (cited 127–33n.). For κλίνω of declining human fortune cf. *OR* 1192 (ἀποκλίνειν, intransitive); the verb may appear in a comparable antithesis at Call. fr. 73.10–12 Hollis (where see H.).

132–3 τοὺς δὲ σῶφρονας | θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακοὺς. ‘The gods love the wise and hate the wicked.’ For the antithetical formulation at the end of a speech cf. 479–80, 691–2, 1314–15, *El.* 821–2n. Morstadt (1863) 1 conjectures ἄνους for κακοὺς (pointing to 763), which gives a neater opposition with σῶφρονας; but the positive adjective, which occurs first, clarifies the nuance of κακοὺς (cf. M. Heath (1987) 169 n. 8).

Odysseus and Athena leave via eisodos A. The warrior remains under the protection of his patron.

PARODOS (134–200)

134–200 The chorus consists of Ajax’s followers, ‘warriors who both manned the ships [cf. 348/9, 356–357/8] and fought the battles [cf. 565]’ (Gardiner (1987) 52). Military men make up the choruses of *Philoctetes* and [Euripides] *Rhesus*; other possible examples include *Achaion Syllogos*, Aeschylus’ *Myrmidons*, *Neaniskoi*, *Epigoni*, Euripides’ *Alope*, *Palamedes*, and *Telephus* (Foley (2003) 27). They arrive after Odysseus has returned to the camp and attributed responsibility for the slaughter to Ajax (141–50). They do not mention his plot against the army, that crucial revelation in Odysseus’ intelligence. Thanks to this partial awareness, which goes unexplained, they ‘may condemn Odysseus as Ajax’s foe, without having to consider the morality of the hero’s motives’ (Gardiner (1987) 57 n. 16).

The form of the parodos, chanted anapaests before sung lyric, is paralleled only in Aeschylus; *Antigone* contains a related form (Introduction, p. 7). Choruses often enter to recited anapaests, whether or not a lyric ensues (cf. Taplin (1977) 64–5), but it is wrong to call them ‘marching anapaests’ for that reason; we do not know whether choruses marched onto the stage (Gardiner (1987) 52–3), and even if they did, the term falsely implies a restriction on the use of this metre (L. Parker (1997) 56–7). The language of the anapaests is generally plain, the most elaborate section being the concluding bird imagery (167–71). The shift to lyric elevates the style, with a concentration of epic features such as τόσσον (183–5n.), hiatus before ἀναξ (191/2–192/3n.), ἀλλ’ ἀνα (n. on 194a)), all reinforced by the opening dactylic rhythm. Difference in register reflects difference in function: the expository anapaests ‘tell [the audience] about the spread of Odysseus’ report through the Greek camp and about reactions to it, while the lyric stanzas move to a more speculative and emotional level’ (M. Heath (1987) 175, comparing *Antigone*).

The chorus’s need for information in the face of dreadful rumours motivates their entry. Desire for news prompts the arrival of choruses in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* and Euripides’ *Hippolytus*, where ‘the chorus which is ignorant of important information puts questions to someone who is off-stage’ (Taplin (1977) 281). In each play the information sought is already known to the audience, thanks to the prologue. The *Hippolytus* parodos provides an especially close parallel (despite being wholly lyric, without anapaests). As in our play, the chorus first state the facts as they know them, and then speculate about their cause (thus Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 141–69); they also ponder the protagonist’s mental state (cf. R. Parker (1983) 244–6). A similar pattern emerges in two fragmentary dramas. One attributed to Euripides ([Eur.] fr. 1132.53–6 *TrGF*) shows a chorus entering with the question τίς δεσπότην ἐμὴν Δανάην | βᾶσις ἔχει κατὰ πτόλιν; | ἦν μήποτ’ ὠφελ’ εἰς ὧτα φέρειν | ὁ πρῶτος τάδε φράσαι πολμήσας, deprecating the rumour (cf. *Aj.* 148–50). In Euripides’ *Aeolus* the chorus ask ἄρ’ ἔτυμον φάτιν ἔγνω | Αἰολὸς εὐνάζειν τέκνα φίλτατα; before an interlocutor replies δοξάσαι ἔστι, κόραι· τὸ δ’ ἐτήτυμον οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν (fr. 17+18 *TrGF*; probably from the parodos, since this marriage sets the action in motion).

The chorus’s loyal concern for Ajax, and dependence on him, are quickly established (134–40). Their devotion to him, expressed so soon after Athena’s praise (119–20), helps his rehabilitation after the shocking revelations of the prologue. They rejoice at Ajax’s success (136); Odysseus and enemies rejoice at his failure (148–53). Such a view is reasonable enough, but the audience has just seen that Odysseus’ attitude is more nuanced (121–6n.). Assuming bad faith on the part of Ajax’s foes allows the chorus to assume that the rumour results from jealousy (154–7); it thus becomes a tribute to the greatness of Ajax, who could scatter his enemies simply by his appearance (167–71).

Even in the anapaests, however, the chorus are not disdainful of the rumour, and admit their fear (137–40). The lyric builds on this underlying anxiety by assuming that the rumour is true, and offers different reasons for Ajax's inexplicable behaviour. The succession of different possible causes reflects the chorus's bewilderment, as they desperately search for an explanation (cf. Pind. *P.* 11.22–7 with my edition, pp. 13–14; contrast the joyous lyric speculation at *OR* 1098–1109). The chorus suggest only two gods as possible authors of Ajax's misfortune, but cite a number of putative insults which may have provoked the former divinity. Sowing with the hand, not the whole sack (contrast Pind. fr. 29 S–M, with Corinna's apocryphal comment), S. thus avoids a tedious list of gods, while conveying the chorus's uncertainty via a range of possibilities.

The chorus's guesses, though wrong, are fair enough; the audience's superior knowledge ensures that they contain ironies. First, the chorus assume that, if Ajax did perpetrate the crime, he was under the sway of a god (183–6); but he began his nocturnal mission (ἐννύχιοι μαχαναί, 180/1–181/2) at his own prompting, and the outcome would have been far worse without divine intervention. Second, the chorus attribute Ajax's attack on the animals to divine anger over missing offerings; in fact it results from Ajax's own anger over denial of tribute (κλυτὰ ἔναρα, 177) owed (in his opinion) to his valour (180/1 μομφὰν ἔχων ξυνοῦ δορός). Third (a proleptic irony, not yet apparent), Ajax's actual offence against a god will turn out to be much worse than any suggested by the chorus (770–7). Even here, when they accept that the rumour is true, they are some way from realising the extent of Ajax's disaster and peril.

The chorus's prayer that the rumour, rather than the disease, may disappear (186–7) signals a return to the assumption of the anapaests: the report, not Ajax's actions, is the real threat. Like the anapaests, the lyric concludes with a request for Ajax to show himself and scatter his enemies; but what there took the form of a conditional here appears as direct imperatives, elaborated across the epode. The mobility of Ajax's enemies contrasts with the fixity of the protagonist, and of the grief which this causes his men.

134 The chorus enter from eisodos A, after a brief pause to allow Odysseus and Athena to leave in that direction (H/OK (2007) 366).

Τελαμώνιε παῖ 'Son of Telamon'. For the adjectival form replacing a genitive see 41n. Since Τελαμώνιος Αἴας and Αἴαντα... Τελαμώνιον υἱόν are common designations of Ajax in Homer, the phrase probably has a Homeric resonance. Addresses to an absent character by a newly-arrived chorus are prominent in the parodoi to Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (see Fraenkel on 83 ff.) and Euripides' *Hippolytus*.

134–5 τῆς ἀμφιρύτου | Σαλαμῖνος ἔχων βάθρον ἀγχίαλον 'you who possess the maritime foundation of sea-girt Salamis'. For Ajax's association with

Salamis cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.557 Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας, [Hes.] fr. 204.44 Μ–W Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἀμώμητος πολεμιστής. For ἔχει cf. Pind. *N.* 4.48 Αἴας Σαλαμῖν' ἔχει πατρώων. For the adjectives cf. [Aesch.] fr. 451q.6 *TrGF* περιρρυ[τ].. [(from a description of Ajax's death, and thus perhaps describing Salamis), Geminus *A.P.* 9.288.3 = 2350 *GP* ἀγχιάλου Σαλαμῖνος. In its Homeric occurrences ἀγχιάλος retains its literal sense 'near the sea' (*Il.* 2.640, 697), but from the sixth century it is applied to islands (cf. *Hom. Hym.* 3.32, Aesch. *Pers.* 890), meaning 'surrounded by sea'. Here its sense scarcely differs from ἀμφίρυτος.

H reads ἀγχιάλον (*coni.* Bothe¹), most manuscripts ἀγχιάλου. H's testimony is unlikely to be a preservation, as it frequently deviates at word-end (e.g. 13, 30, 39, 42, 43, 76, 90, 106, 118). But Bothe's change is so small (cf. 176, 718) that manuscripts are anyway of limited value. Elsewhere in tragedy, wherever βάθρον is accompanied by a defining genitive and an adjective, it is always qualified by the adjective (I asterisk metrically secure instances): *860 πατρώων ἐστίας βάθρον, *Phil.* 1000 γῆς τόδ' αἰπεινὸν βάθρον, *OC* 1662 γῆς ἀλάμπτεον βάθρον, **Ant.* 854 ὑψηλὸν... Δίκας βάθρον, Eur. *Her.* 715 ἀγνοῖς Ἑστίας... βάθροισι [Stephanus: βόθ- cod.], **Phoen.* 982 σεμνὰ Δωδώνης βάθρα, Eur. **IA* [81–2] στενόπορ' Αὐλίδος βάθρα |... τῆσδε, 1263 Τροίας... κλεινὸν [Reiske: καινὸν cod.] βάθρον. In the absence of other secure criteria, we should assume that our passage follows this well-established pattern.

Dawe, *STS* 1 131, states the above argument, and adds another: namely, 'Salamis has one epithet already'. A secure parallel for an equitable distribution of adjectives occurs at 859–60 ὦ γῆς ἱερὸν οἰκείας πέδον | Σαλαμῖνος; but at Eur. *Hipp.* 128–9 θερμαῖς δ' ἐπὶ νῶτα πέτραις | εὐαλίου κατέβαλλ' a defining genitive noun is accompanied by two adjectives, the noun it defines by none. (In other cases the defined noun has both adjectives: see Diggle (1974) 7 = (1994) 95, (1981a) 48–9.) Other potential parallels, such as fr. 202 *TrGF* ἄλλ' ὦ πατρώας γῆς ἀγνιαίου [–ον Bothe] πέδον, *Phil.* 1289 ἀπώμοσ' ἀγνοῦ [–ὸν Wakefield] Ζηνὸς ὕψιστον [–ου VTa, *coni.* Wakefield] σέβας, and Eur. *Med.* 211–12 ἄλμυρὸν | Πόντου κλῆδ' ἀπέραντον [–ου Milton], are textually uncertain.

On p. 61 of his 1824 edition (but not in subsequent editions), Wunder attributes this conjecture to 'Kämmerer ad Hymn. Hom. p. 146 sq.' I suspect that Kämmerer is a backformation from Camerarius, the Renaissance scholar whose real vernacular name was Joachim Kammermeister. (Cf. Bywater (1914) 88 on the solecism 'Turnèbe' for Turnebus, or Adrien de Tournebou.) But no edition of the *Homeric Hymns* by Camerarius is known to exist. Wunder's reference also eluded Lobeck (second edition p. 129 n. * = third edition p. 107 n. 1). (Wolff (1852) 519 writes 'Doch schon Bothe, dann Kämmerer ad Hom. hymn. p. 146 haben ἀγχιάλον conjicirt', placing Kämmerer after Bothe.)

136 σὲ μὲν εὖ πράσσοντ' ἐπιχαίρω· 'I rejoice when you are prospering.' For the idea that dependants delight in their master's success cf. Eur. fr. 773.46–9 *TrGF* (*Phaethon*) δμωσὶν γὰρ ἀνάκτων | εὐαμερίαι προσιοῦσαι | μολπῇ θάρσος ἄγουσ' ἐπιχάρματά τ', where the noun denotes 'the joy of participation in another's happiness' (Diggle, on his line 93). Cairns (2006) 103 calls this an 'epinician premise', but the Euripidean quotation is a closer parallel; the epinician passages which he cites assert the importance of praise (via poetry) for success, which is not the chorus's point. Cairns tries to show that the parodos has an epinician flavour, but he is too quick to see epinician (or Pindaric) significance in expressions which, while found in epinician, are not distinctively such. For example, the genealogical metaphor in 173–4 is not 'thoroughly Pindaric' (p. 123 n. 30), but a poetic commonplace which occurs in tragedy, lyric, and other genres.

For the accusative after a verb of rejoicing (etc.) cf. *Phil.* 1314 ἦσθην πατέρα τὸν ἄμὸν εὐλογοῦντά σε, Eur. *Hipp.* 1339–40 τοὺς γὰρ εὐσεβεῖς θεοὶ | θνήσκοντας οὐ χαίρουσι, fr. 673 *TrGF*, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 390, Bruhn §60, K–G 1 298; also 789–90n. Anaphora of σέ in 136–7 recalls a common feature of hymns (Norden (1913) 149–60).

137–40 σὲ δ' ὅταν πληγὴ Διὸς ἡ ζαμενῆς | λόγος ἐκ Δαναῶν κακόθρους ἐπιβῇ, | μέγαν ὄκνον ἔχω καὶ πεφόβημαι | πτηνῆς ὡς ὄμμα πελείας. 'But when the stroke of Zeus or a mighty, malicious rumour assails you from the Danaans, I am in great anxiety, and fearful like the eye of a flying dove.' This statement of how Ajax's troubles afflict the chorus (cf. Eur. fr. 85 *TrGF* μέτεσι τοῖς δούλοισι δεσποτῶν νόσου) balances 136 (as indicated by μὲν . . . δέ, and σέ in anaphora); taken together, 136–40 form a polar expression emphasising the chorus's dependence. Pearson (1912b) 427–8 takes 137–40 as a specific reference to Ajax's current situation (with ὅταν meaning 'so now that'), asking rhetorically 'are we to suppose that Ajax was subject to attacks of madness, or has suffered at other times from the malicious plots of his companions?' But this ruins the parallelism between the μὲν and δέ clauses by making one general and one particular, and misses the signalling of the move to the particular by ὡς καὶ . . . νῦν (141; cf. A. G. Laird (1922) 42–3). Rather, what is formally a general statement incorporates aspects of the present trouble. This links it to the forthcoming description of Ajax's state, and, through the elaboration, emphasises this more negative part of the polar expression.

For the πληγὴ Διὸς cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 367 (the Trojans) Διὸς πλαγὰν ἔχουσιν εἰπεῖν, Heracl. D–K 22 B 11 (1 153.15–16) πᾶν . . . ἐρπετὸν πληγῇ νέμεται, West (1997) 569; also words for 'scourge, goad' at *Phil.* 1039 κέντρον θεῖον, Hom. *Il.* 12.37 Διὸς μάστιγι δαμέντες, Aesch. *Sept.* 608 πληγεῖς θεοῦ μάστιγι παγκοίνῳ δάμη, West (1997) 116 with n. 56, 556.

ζαμενής is 'spirited', 'powerful', not 'inspired' (so correctly Braswell (1979) 185 and on Pind. *P.* 4.10(f)). Not attested elsewhere in tragedy (though plausibly restored at Eur. *Med.* 1266; see Diggle (1984a) 62 = (1994) 292), it first occurs at *Hom. Hym.* 4.307 and 495, and is common in Pindar; cf. however ζαμενέω at Hes. *Th.* 928. Madvig (1871–84) 1 207 moves the adjective before πληγή, arguing that the transmitted text gives λόγος two adjectives, the former inapposite. (Herwerden (1887) 4 claims to have made the change first.) But elaboration of λόγος ἐκ Δαναῶν is preferable, since that is what the chorus will emphasise. Moreover, equalising the distribution of adjectives is not necessarily desirable (134–5n.); while ending an anapaestic dimeter with a prepositive monosyllable is at least undesirable (JD).

κακόθρους (*hapax*) could be 'spoken by evil people' (cf. δημόθρους), but 'speaking evil' (cf. δύσθρους) better fits the personification of the rumour inherent in ἐπιβῆ; both senses are probably felt. For ἐπιβαινῶ predicated of an unpleasant abstract see *El.* 492n. For the accusative personal object cf. *OR* 1299–1300 τίς σ', ὦ τλήμων, | προσέβη μανία;, Eur. *Andr.* 492–3 ἔτι σε, πότνια, μετατροπὰ τῶνδ' ἔπεισιν ἔργων, Long (1968) 136 n. 82.

Fear is idiomatically manifested in the eye: cf. *OC* 729–30 ὁρῶ τιν' ὑμᾶς ὀμμάτων εἰληφότας | φόβον νεώρη, *Tr.* 527–8 τὸ δ' ἀμφινείκητον ὄμμα νύμφας | ἔλινδον ἀμμένει <~>. The perfect πεφόβημαι recurs in tragedy only at 253/4, where, as here, there appears to be no difference from the present. Dove comparisons (first in Homer: *Il.* 5.778 τῷ δὲ βάτην τρήρῳσι πελειάσιον ἴθμαθ' ὁμοῖαι) denote fear at e.g. Aesch. *Suppl.* 223–4 ἔσμος ὥς πελειάδων | ἴζεσθε κίρκων τῶν ὁμοπτέρων φόβῳ, *Sept.* 291–4, Eur. *Andr.* 1140–1, Ap. Rh. 1.1049, Ov. *Met.* 1.506. LMLC points out that all of these refer to women or goddesses, except for the *Andromache* passage; if dove comparisons were regarded as especially appropriate for females, this would further emphasise the chorus's weakness.

Pierson (1752) 5–9 conjectures φήνης... πελειάς, giving 'I take fright like a dove at the eye (or appearance) of a vulture' (cf. 167). (Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 304 (pp. 255–6) tentatively identifies the φήνη as the 'Lammergeier, formerly Bearded Vulture'; Hom. *Od.* 16.217 associates it with the αἰγυπιός.) This balances the opposition between metaphorical birds great and small at 169–71; and in the passages cited above timid doves are often opposed to a more fearsome avian companion (cf. Thompson (1936) 227–8). But even with the conjecture, the parallel with 169–71 is not exact, as there the αἰγυπιός corresponds to Ajax, whereas here the φήνη would do duty for the stroke of Zeus and the rumours of the Greeks. The change would also omit the dove's fearful ὄμμα. Pierson wishes to eliminate the adjective, but for πτηνός predicated uninformatively of a bird cf. *Ant.* 1082, *Phil.* 955.

141 ὥς καὶ τῆς νῦν φθιμένης νυκτός ‘So too during this last night’. ὥς ‘brings us from the *general* point of view in ὅταν to the *particular* occurrences of the past night’ (A. G. Laird (1922) 42; cf. Verdenius (1956) 249, on καί). Through καί ‘other times are *assumed*, whether there have been other such or no’ (Laird p. 43); compare καὶ γάρ introducing a paradigm which illustrates a general truth (see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1040). For φθίνομαι predicated of νύξ cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.330 πρὶν γάρ κεν καὶ νύξ φθῖτ’ ἄμβροτος, 11.183 = 13.338 = 16.39; also Aesch. *Pers.* 377–8 ἐπεὶ δὲ φέγγος ἡλίου κατέφθιτο | καὶ νύξ ἐπῆει, *Ag.* 7 (predicated of stars).

142–3 μεγάλοι θόρυβοι κατέχουσ’ ἡμᾶς | ἐπὶ δυσκλείᾳ ‘loud clamours beset us, bringing disgrace’. Transitive κατέχω can be predicated of hostile talk (cf. Pind. *P.* 1.96 ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντῆ φάτις) and its opposite (cf. *O.* 7.10 ὁ δ’ ὀλβιος, ὃν φᾶμαι κατέχωντ’ ἀγαθαί), as well as of loud sounds in general (cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 426–7 οἰμωγὴ δ’ ὁμοῦ | κωκύμασιν κατεῖχε πελαγίαν ἄλλα, Eur. *Tro.* 555–7); compare the related intransitive sense ‘be prevalent’ (cf. Andoc. 1.130 κληδὼν ἐν ἀπάσῃ τῇ πόλει κατεῖχεν, Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1465–6). For ἐπὶ with the dative marking the ‘end in view, result’ (Moorhouse 113) cf. *Ant.* 791–2 σὺ καὶ δικαίων ἀδίκους | φρένας παρασπᾶς ἐπὶ λώβῃ.

143–5 σὲ τὸν ἵππομανῆ | λειμῶν’ ἐπιβάντ’ ὀλέσαι Δαναῶν | βοτὰ καὶ λείαν ‘saying that you invaded the meadow that abounds with horses, and destroyed the beasts that were the spoil of the Danaans’. This meadow has Homeric precedent at *Il.* 20.221 τοῦ (i.e. Erichthonius) τρισχειλία ἵπποι ἔλος κάτω βουκολέοντο | θήλειαι, πώλοισιν ἀγαλλόμεναι ἀταλῆσιν; cf. Quint. Smyrn. 2.487 στείνεται δὲ κταμένων πεδίων μέγα θ’ ἵππόβοτόν τε.

For ἵππομανῆς ‘equis abundans’ (Wakefield (1789) 27) cf. the verbs ὕλομανέω (Theophr. *CP* 3.1.5 ὁ δὲ θερμός ἄκαρπος γίνεται, καθάπερ ὕλομανῶν καὶ ἐξυβρίζων, Strabo 14.6.5 = Eratosthenes fr. III B 91 (p. 338 Berger) ὕλομανούντων τῶν πεδίων, ὥστε κατέχεσθαι δρυμοῖς καὶ μὴ γεωργεῖσθαι) and φυλλομανέω (Theophr. *HP* 8.7.4); see further Schneider (1905) 127–9. The other instance of the suffix in S., fr. 652 *TrGF* καρπομανῆς, is textually uncertain and contextually obscure; while the plant ἵππομανές, so named because it drove horses wild (Theocr. 2.48–9, where see Gow), is not relevant. The plain is the sort of area where horses would normally run wild; at the moment, however, it contains captured animals, not including horses. (Reitzenstein (1890–1) 17 shows that some of the discussions in the scholia are owed to the grammarian Pius, since they appear under his name in the *Etymologicum Genuinum*. He may date to the late third or early fourth century AD (so De Marco (1937) 113–14 n. 24) or slightly earlier (so Van der Valk (1963–4) I 437 n. 120). Apart from this passage, his fragments contain only one other comment on S., discussed at 405a–408/9n.) For other tragic periphrases involving λειμών cf. *Tr.* 188 βουτερεῖ λειμῶνι (glossed by Hesych. β 890 = I 337 Latte as ἐν ᾧ βόες

θήρους ὥρᾳ νέμονται), Aesch. *Suppl.* 540 λειμῶνα βούχilon ('cow-pasturing meadow': see FJ/W).

146 ἦπερ δορίληπτος ἔτ' ἦν λοιπὴ 'which were what still remained of the booty won by the spear'. λοιπὴ implies that this property was left over from previous distributions. The minority variant κοινή (*coni.* Herwerden, p. 124 n. 1 of his edition of *OR*, citing 54, 175) is approved by West (1978a) 109 ('the undistributed booty was still common property, Ajax had no right to lay hands on it'). κοινή (= ξυνή, ξυνήϊη in Ionic) is paralleled by Hom. *Il.* 1.124–5 οὐδέ τί που ἴδμεν ξυνήϊα κείμενα πολλὰ: | ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολλῶν ἐξεπράθομεν, τὰ δέδοστα; West also cites Hom. *Il.* 15.193 γὰρ δ' ἔτι ξυνή ('yet to be shared out'). But while a gloss can preserve the truth (cf. perhaps 802, 1009, 1117, 1274, O at *OR* 18, Dawe (1964) 57), here κοινή looks like a true gloss amplifying λοιπή.

For a short syllable running over the end of an anapaestic metron see *El.* 94–5n, adding Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 52.

147 κτείνοντ' αἴθωνι σιδήρῳ. 'killing them with gleaming iron.' The period closes with an epic phrase (cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.485, *Od.* 1.184, Hes. *Op.* 743), used in heightened contexts (cf. S. P.Oxy. 4807 col. ii.5 (in Mülke (2007) 21, with his commentary, p. 23), Ar. *Pax* 1330, Hermippus fr. 47.7 *PCG*, McKay (1961) 19 n. 1), which jars in a description of unheroic animal slaughter.

148–9 τοιούσδε λόγους ψιθύρους πλάσσων | εἰς ὦτα φέρει πᾶσιν Ὀδυσσεύς 'Such are the whispered words which Odysseus fashions and pours in the ears of all'. For the subdued, secret nature of hostile talk cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 449–51 τάδε σῖγά τις βαῦζει, | φθονερὸν δ' ὑπ' ἄλγος ἔρπει | προδίκους Ἀτρεΐδαις, Pind. *N.* 4.39–41 φθονερά δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων | γνῶμαν κενεὰν σκότῳ κυλινδῇ | χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν. Speaking to the ear suggests slander (cf. Lucian 15.21 οὐ γὰρ οἶδ' ὅπως ἡδόμεθα πάντες λαθρηδὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸ οὖς λεγόμενα καὶ μεστὰ [Du Soul *e versione Syriaca*: πρὸς τὰς λεγομένας καὶ μεστὰς codd.] ὑπονοίας ἀκούοντες), as does ψιθύρος (cf. Ar. fr. 172 *PCG* ψιθύρός τ' ἐκαλοῦ καὶ ψωμοκόλας, Pind. *P.* 2.74–6 οὐδ' ἀπάταισι θυμὸν τέρπεται ἔνδοθεν, | οἷα ψιθύρων παλάμαις ἔπειτ' αἰεὶ βροτῶν | ἄμαχον κακὸν ἀμφοτέροις διαβολιᾷν ὑποφάτιες κτλ.). For πλάσσω of falsehood cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 1030–1 ὥς δδ' οὐ πεπλάσμενος | ὁ κόμπος, LSJ⁹ s.v. v, D. Müller (1974) 112–13; also πλαστός at S. *OR* 780, Eur. *Ba.* 218. For εἰς ὦτα φέρει cf. Tr. Adesp. fr. 386 *TrGF* οἶμοι, τὸ κακὸν τῆς εὐτυχίας | ὥς μᾶλλον ἐς οὖς φέρεται θνητῶν.

I take πᾶσιν as original, with the minority variant πάντων as a gloss which displaced it in two witnesses (28n.). πάντων could be an emendation to give an easier construction (Easterling (1967) 59); but the reverse emendation, from genitive to dative, is also possible, since the possessive dative was the kind of well-known idiom which scribes were tempted to introduce (*El.* 305–6n.).

Nauck (1860 edn) prints πάντων followed by Ὀδυσσεύς. Tragedy contains only one instance of the latter form (Eur. *Hec.* 141, metrically guaranteed); however, that is the only case from anapaests, the others being from iambic trimeters or trochaic tetrameters (cf. Davidson (1975) 176 n. 33, (1984); also 210n.). Similarly, Ἀχιλεὺς occurs in tragedy only in anapaests (Euripides) and lyric ([Eur.] *Rhesus*). Nauck could well be right.

150–1 καὶ σφόδρα πείθει· περὶ γὰρ σοῦ νῦν | εὖπειστα λέγει ‘and he thoroughly persuades them; for what he now says about you is most persuasive’. Odysseus’ rhetorical skill, emphasised in Homer (*Il.* 3.216–24 and throughout the *Odyssey*), is attacked in tragedy as the mark of a demagogue (cf. Eur. *Hec.* 131–3 ὁ ποικιλόφρων | κόπις ἡδυλόγος δημοχαραστῆς | Λαερτιάδης πείθει στρατιάν, *Tro.* 285–8). Here, however, his success is attributed not to his own skills, but to the inherent credibility of his accusations: a remarkable claim from Ajax’s supporters.

Manuscripts are split between εὖπειστα and εὖπιστα, a common confusion (cf. Pearson on fr. 627 ἄπιστος); preceding πείθει demands εὖπειστα (the connexion, made clear by γὰρ, recommends punctuating after πείθει with a raised point, not a full stop).

151–3 καὶ πᾶς ὁ κλυών | τοῦ λέξαντος χαίρει μᾶλλον | τοῖς σοῖς ἄχουσιν καθυβρίζων. ‘And everyone, when he hears, takes greater pleasure than the man who told him in jeering at your afflictions.’ Kamerbeek¹ writes κλυών for manuscript κλύων; the present participle would be coincident with λέξαντος, χαίρει, and καθυβρίζων, but it is hard to listen, rejoice, and insult at the same time. West (1984) 175, 178 rightly urges the same reinterpretation of the paradosis at 1000, 1320, and 1323. For malicious rejoicing cf. the adjective κακόχαρτος, predicated by Hesiod of Ἔρις and Ζῆλος (*Op.* 28, 195–6).

καθυβρίζω normally takes the accusative or genitive (*El.* 522n.), but for the dative cf. Hdt. 1.212.3, Lobeck’s n., K–G 1 407. ὕβρις and its compounds and congeners occur at 197, 304, 367, 954/5, 971, [1061], 1088, 1151, 1258, 1385; many of these ‘are found in the horrified responses of Ajax and his supporters to the fact that his enemies are now in a position even more to humiliate and laugh at him in his heightened disgrace’ (Fisher (1992) 316). Mockery does not necessarily involve ὕβρις (Cairns (1993a) 229–30), but Ajax characteristically assumes the most grievous response possible on the part of his foes. In his madness, Ajax applies the term to the offences which he believes that he is avenging (304); Menelaus applies it more generally to both Ajax and himself (1088). Teucer accuses Menelaus of ὕβρις (1151), but has that charge turned back on him by Agamemnon (1258). In the end he will thank Odysseus for not indulging in ὕβρις towards the dead Ajax (1384–5).

154–6 τῶν γὰρ μεγάλων ψυχῶν ἰεῖς | οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι· κατὰ δ' ἂν τις ἐμοῦ | τοιαῦτα λέγων οὐκ ἂν πείθοι. 'For if a man aimed at great souls, he would not miss; but someone saying such things against me would not persuade.' The chorus move away from the plausibility of the specific accusation to the general claim that the small attack the great; they thus counter the rumour by making it a tribute to his greatness. 'Ellipse of τις is legitimate when there is a participle to replace it' (Davies's Addenda on *Tr.* 2, after Diggle): cf. *El.* 697n., adding Elmsley on Eur. *Med.* 188, Fowler (2006) 46–7. One minority variant, ἀμάρτη, shows corruption from –οι through confusion of optative and subjunctive. The other, ἀμάρτοις, results in a clumsy shift from οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοις to οὐκ ἂν πείθοι (where τις guarantees the third person).

157 πρὸς γὰρ τὸν ἔχονθ' ὁ φθόνος ἔρπει. 'For envy creeps towards the powerful man.' The chorus's thought 'throws light on the greatness of the object of envy' (M. Heath (1987) 175): cf. Com. Adesp. fr. 909.12 *PCG* πρὸς γὰρ τὸ λαμπρὸν ὁ φθόνος βιάζεται, Eur. fr. 294.2 *TrGF* εἰς τἀπίσημα δ' ὁ φθόνος πηδᾷ φιλεῖ, Antiphanes *A.P.* 9.256.5 = 745 *GP*, Dionysius *TrGF* 76 F 8 with Stephanopoulos (1988) 18. Pindar introduces Ajax's suicide with the idea (*N.* 8.21–3): ὅσον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν, | ἄπτεται δ' ἐσλῶν αἰεῖ, χειρόνεσσι δ' οὐκ ἐρίζει. | κείνος καὶ Τελαμώνος δάψεν υἱόν κτλ. For ὁ ἔχων denoting a rich or powerful man see Collard on Eur. *Suppl.* 240–1a. For ἔρπω in this context cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 450 (cited 148–9n.) with Fraenkel; there the verb appears to describe a secret (and menacing) approach, which fits our passage.

158–9 καίτοι σμικροὶ μεγάλων χωρὶς | σφαλερὸν πύργου ῥῦμα πέλονται· 'And yet small men separated from great ones are an unsafe tower of defence.' Stability requires a combination of the mighty and the weak: cf. Eur. fr. 21.1–4 *TrGF* δοκεῖτ' ἂν οἰκεῖν †γᾶν†, εἰ πένης ἅπας | λαὸς πολιτεύοιτο πλουσιῶν ἄτερ; | οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο χωρὶς ἐσθλὰ καὶ κακά, | ἀλλ' ἔστι τις σύγκρασις, ὥστ' ἔχειν καλῶς, Pl. *Leg.* 902d οὐ μὴν (*sc.* ἔξει καλῶς) οὐδὲ κυβερνήταις οὐδὲ στρατηγοῖς οὐδ' οἰκονόμοις, οὐδ' αὖ τισὶν πολιτικοῖς οὐδ' ἄλλω τῶν τοιούτων οὐδενί, χωρὶς τῶν ὀλίγων καὶ σμικρῶν πολλὰ ἢ μεγάλα.

For καίτοι 'introduc[ing] an objection . . . of the speaker's own, which tends to invalidate, or cast doubt upon, what he has just said' (Denniston 556) cf. 441, 552; contrast 855n. The chorus claim not that their previous statement is false, but that it implies a morally objectionable attitude.

Manuscripts read σμικροί, although μικροί is possible. At 161 most have σμικροτέρων, but μικροτέρων is metrically guaranteed. This distribution is consistent with Page's view (on Eur. *Med.* 171) that 'metre permitting, tragedy prefers σμικρός. See further *El.* 1113n.

For σφαλερὸν cf. Eur. *Med.* 390 ἦν μὲν τις ἡμῖν πύργος ἀσφαλῆς φανῇ. The *Suda*'s χαλεπὸν (ρ 291 = iv 306.28 Adler; in most manuscripts) shows

displacement of the original by a more familiar word of a similar shape and meaning (56–8n.).

πύργου ῥῦμα forms a single idea, ‘protection which consists of a tower’ and hence ‘tower of defence’ (Campbell after Lobeck). For the constituent genitive cf. Eur. *IA* 189 ἀσπίδος ἔρυμα and *El.* 758n. Metaphorical πύργος is commonly predicated of men (cf. *OR* 1199/1200–1200 θανάτων δ’ ἐμᾶ | χώρᾳ πύργος ἀνέστας, Alcaeus fr. 112.10 Voigt ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλιος πύργος ἀρεῖοι, Eur. *Alc.* 311, *Med.* 390 (cited above), Callinus fr. 1.20 *IEG*, Psalm 31.3, 61.3). Ajax is assimilated to one by Homer’s Odysseus (*Od.* 11.556 τοῖος γὰρ σφιν πύργος ἀπώλεο), as is his shield in the *Iliad* (18–19n.); cf. also his description ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* 3.229, 6.5, 7.211). Compare the related idea (first attested in Alcaeus) that men, not buildings, make a city (cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 349 ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἔρκος ἔστιν ἀσφαλές, Thuc. 7.77.7). Alternatively, πύργου is an objective genitive (‘are unsafe guardians of a wall’). But this removes the metaphorical quality of πύργος, leaving a strangely specific, and banal, point about the capacity of the weak to maintain fortifications.

160–1 μετὰ γὰρ μεγάλων βαιὸς ἄριστ’ ἂν | καὶ μέγας ὀρθοῖθ’ ὑπὸ μικροτέρων. ‘For a lowly man accompanied by great, and a great man attended by small, have the most prosperous course.’ ὑπό marks that the lesser are to serve the greater: μετὰ, that the great require the cooperation of the less’ (Campbell). Fehling (1969) 304–6 cites the passage as an instance of ‘reciprocal repetition’ (cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.63 σοὶ μὲν ἐγώ, σὺ δ’ ἐμοί), which emphasises the mutual interest of both sides. For middle ὀρθόομαι cf. *Ant.* 675, *El.* 742, Thuc. 3.30.4 στρατηγὸς . . . πλείστ’ ἂν ὀρθοῖτο. For μικροτέρων see 158–9n.

162–3 ἀλλ’ οὐ δυνατόν τοὺς ἀνοήτους | τούτων γνώμας προδιδάσκειν. ‘But it is not possible to teach foolish men judgment in these matters.’ ‘Like προμαθεῖν in 966, προδιδάσκειν simply = “teach”, because teaching precedes the practice of what is taught’ (Dover on Ar. *Nub.* 476; cf. Moorhouse 122, Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 7.5). According to Jebb, the verb ‘properly implies *gradual* teaching . . . and is fitting here because the truths are elementary’; but would the chorus thus belittle their gnomic wisdom? He compares Pl. *Gorg.* 489d πρᾶτότερόν με προδίδασκε, but see Dodds *ad loc.* (‘Socrates hopes his “teacher” will tell him in advance what to say’). Jebb’s notes on προ– at *Phil.* 538 and 1015 are no more convincing. On the punctuation at the end of this line see next n.

164 ὑπὸ τοιοῦτων ἀνδρῶν θορυβῇ ‘Such are the men who clamour against you.’ The connexion between τοιοῦτων and ἀνοήτους (162) smooths the asyndeton. After the general statement about foolish men, the chorus apply that designation to the rumour-mongers. This tells against punctuating before this

line with a comma, as recommended by Dale (1960) 17. She is right, however, to deprecate beginning a new paragraph at 164: the sense is continuous, and the catalectic anapaest in 163 need not mark the end of a unit (cf. 136–7, bound together by anaphora of σέ).

165–6 χήμεις οὐδὲν σθένομεν πρὸς ταῦτ' | ἀπαλέξασθαι σοῦ χωρίς, ἄναξ. 'And we have no strength to resist this when separated from you, lord.' In 154–63 the chorus directs its moralising against slanderers ignorant of the benefits brought by a great man. These reflections apply to the chorus, who are powerless without Ajax (σοῦ χωρίς ~ 158 μεγάλων χωρίς), and to Ajax, now separated from his men. The connexion remains implicit, the advice politely indirect.

S. uses ἀπαλέξασθαι (aorist middle of ἀλέξω, ἀλέκω) in this sense again at fr. 303 *TrGF* = Hesych. α 5741 (1 196 Latte) ἀπαλέξασθαι· ἀποφυλάξασθαι. Σοφοκλῆς Ἰππώνω and possibly at *Aj.* 656 (n.); elsewhere it occurs at Aesch. *Suppl.* 1052 ἀπαλέξει (see FJ/W). The only other part attested in tragedy is the future middle (uncompounded), found at *OR* 171/2, 539. Both uncompounded and compounded forms are found in Homer (the latter only in the active: *Il.* 24.371, *Od.* 17.364), and in prose (Herodotus, Xenophon, Hippocrates).

167–71 The imagery at the close of the anapaests continues to contrast what happens when Ajax is away with what happens when he is present. For the picture Gardiner (1987) 55 compares Hom. *Il.* 18.222–31, where the mere sound and sight of Achilles causes the Trojans consternation and paralysis.

167–8 ἀλλ' ὅτε γὰρ δὴ τὸ σὸν ὄμμ' ἀπέδραν, | παταγοῦσιν ἄπερ πτηνῶν ἄγέλαι· 'But when they have escaped your countenance, they chatter like flocks of birds.' ἀλλὰ . . . γὰρ make up a single unit, 'marking the contrast between what is . . . subsidiary and what is vital, primary, or decisive' (Denniston 101). Ajax's dread ὄμμα returns three times: at 192/3, similar to the present passage; at 462, where in his despair he wonders what ὄμμα he could present to his father; and at 1004, where his ὄμμα remains terrifying even in death. One can only imagine the grim visage represented on the actor's mask.

For ἀποδιδράσκω with the accusative see 82. For tragic examples of the suffix (instead of ἀπέδρασαν) see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1247–8, Sideras (1971) 105–6.

παταγέω denotes the chatter of birds at Arist. *HA* 632b16–18 (ὁ κόττυφος) ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ θέρει ᾗδει, τοῦ δὲ χειμῶνος παταγεῖ καὶ φέγγεται θορυβῶδες. It is not found elsewhere in tragedy; πάταγος occurs five times, always of weapons clashing (e.g. *Ant.* 125, *Tr.* 517/18). The verb is predicated of Ajax's foes, not the birds, and thus shows partial assimilation of *illustrans* to *illustrandum* (cf. 169–71n., Davies on *Tr.* 31ff.). 'Disparaging comparisons of individuals to birds often single out their squawking noise for mention' (MD, citing Pind.

O. 2.86–8 μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι | παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὥς ἄκραντα γαρούετον | Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον).

Manuscripts read ἄπερ, ἄτε, and ἄτερ, the last probably the result of confusion between the others. ἄτε is common in this sense in lyric, from Alcman (fr. 1.62 *PMGF*) to Pindar (cf. Ruijgh (1971) 983–4), and in Herodotus (cf. Deniston 526); elsewhere in tragedy it occurs once (Eur. *Her.* 667, lyric, metrically guaranteed; *Or.* 206 is corrupt). Note also ὥσεῖτε at *Ant.* 653. ἄπερ with this meaning is more common, occurring in tragedy at *OR* 175/6 ἄπερ εὐπτερον ὄρνιν (lyric, metrically guaranteed), Aesch. *Cho.* 381 (where see Garvie), *Eum.* 131, 660; cf. also ἀπερεί at *El.* 189. The corruption can be paralleled in either direction (as noted by Dawe, *STS* 1 132 n. 1): at *Ti.* 118 ὥσπερ has been corrupted to ὥστε in all but one manuscript group, whereas at Aesch. *Ag.* 1671 ὥστε is Canter's necessary correction of transmitted ὥσπερ. For confusion between περ and τε more generally see Schaefer's edition of Gregory of Corinth, p. 888. Either is possible, but I print ἄπερ as the only form attested in S. or Aeschylus, and as the reading of our two oldest sources.

Dawe supports ἄτε because (i) ἄπερ may be a metrical correction by someone unaware that a word-final short vowel followed by initial πτ– forms a long syllable, (ii) καθάπερ is 'a familiar word in the vocabulary of scholiasts', and (iii) ἄτε 'is comparatively rare – but adequately attested'. But (i) metrical emendation of anapaests this early (before 950) is unexpected (it has not occurred in the following dimeter, which lacks a long syllable in the same position, and contains a further unmetrical word in some manuscripts, including some with ἄπερ). (ii) The prefix in καθάπερ makes all the difference; there is no evidence for confusion with that word here. (iii) *OR* 175/6 (cited above) shows that ἄπερ was also rare enough to baffle scribes.

πτηγῶν will be neuter rather than masculine, as at e.g. Aesch. *Cho.* 591 πτανά (see Diggle (1994) 459–60). ἀγέλαι may have been the regular word for a flock of birds at this period (cf. Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 591), but for a possible additional reason for its use see next n.

169–71 μέγαν αἰγυπιὸν <δ> ὑποδείσαντες | τάχ' ἄν, ἐξαίφνης εἰ σὺ φανείης, | σιγῇ πτήξειαν ἄφωνοι. 'Yet were you suddenly to appear, they would no doubt take fright before the great vulture and cower in silence, voiceless' (Lloyd-Jones, adapted). Noting the shift from simile to metaphor (167–8n.), Jebb compares *Ant.* 110–23, where Polynices first flies into the land like an eagle (112/13 αἰετὸς ἐς γῆν ὥς ὑπερέπτα), but then is directly predicated with actions suiting a monstrous beast (118 ἀμφιγῶν, 120–2 πρὶν ποθ' ἀμετέρων | αἰμάτων γένυσιν πλησθῆναι). In each case the effect is intensificatory. The contrast between this image and that of 139–40 expresses the relative power of Ajax and the chorus, along with the reversal of situation, from fear to triumph, for which the chorus hopes.

Large birds can inspire fear in their smaller brethren: cf. (in addition to the examples involving doves cited at 137–40n.) Lesb. incert. auct. fr. 10 Voigt ἔπταζον ὡς ὄρνιθες ὥκυν | αἶετον ἑξαπίννας φάνεντα (perhaps imitated by S.), Hom. *Od.* 22.302–6 οἱ δ' ὡς τ' αἰγυπιοὶ γαμφώνυχες ἀγκυλοχεῖλαι | ἐξ ὀρέων ἐλθόντες ἐπ' ὄρνιθεςσι θόρωσι· | ταὶ μὲν τ' ἐν πεδίῳ νέφεα πτώσσουσιν ἱένται, | οἱ δέ τε τὰς δλέκουσιν ἐπάλμενοι, οὐδέ τις ἀλκή | γίγνεται οὐδὲ φυγή· χαίρουσι δέ τ' ἄνδρες ἄγρη (following a simile in which the suitors, in response to Athena's intervention, ἐφέβοντο κατὰ μέγαρον βόες ὡς ἀγελαῖαι; could this have provoked πτηνῶν ἀγέλαι in 168, as Kamerbeek suggests?), Alcman fr. 82 *PMGF* λῦσαν δ' ἄπρακτα νεάνιδες ὥτ' ὄρνις φέρακος ὑπερπταμένω.

<δ> (coni. Dawes (1745) 224–6) provides the necessary long sixth syllable in 169. So would <σ> (Toup (1760–6) III 23) or <γ> (B. Heath (1762) 3); but only <δ> (preceded by two words: 116–17n.) improves the syntax, by making μέγαν αἰγυπιὸν the start of a new sense unit highlighting Ajax's power over his enemies. Without it, ὅτε... ὑποδείσαντες must be taken together, leaving ἀλλ' bereft until at last we reach τάχ' ἄν. Within ὅτε... ὑποδείσαντες, we must take ὑποδείσαντες either with ἀγέλαι (contrary to its gender; a very rare usage, discussed by Langholf (1977) and Petersmann (1979)), or with the unexpressed subject of ἀπέδραν (which involves confusing word order, as well as a sudden switch from simile in 168 to metaphor in 169). Rather than supplement, Dobree (pre-1825) II 42–3 deletes ὑποδείσαντες as an intrusion from the scholia, but as Jebb shows (p. 221), the ancient commentator had the participle in his text.

More often wrongly inserted than omitted, perhaps δέ was removed here by someone who took μέγαν αἰγυπιὸν ὑποδείσαντες with what precedes, as one might on a cursory reading; both lines involve birds, and one has a main verb, the other a participle. The unmetrical variant ὑποδδ– may have been introduced as a distinctively Homeric form. (Most manuscripts of that poet, ancient and mediaeval, have a double delta in that verb when the second syllable is heavy.)

ἐξαίφνης goes with φανείης (not πτήξειαν), as in the Lesbian parallel cited above and Hom. *Od.* 24.160 ἑξαπίνης προφανέντ'. The adverb colours the otherwise plain εἰ σὺ φανείης: the chorus want Ajax to appear *now*.

‘πτήσσω... is especially used of birds... and other animals... which cower when frightened or disturbed and thus applied to men... who feel fear or awe’ (Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.57(b)): cf. (in addition to the Lesbian and Homeric similes cited above) Stes. fr. S21.3 *PMGF* (suppl.), Bacchyl. 13.116–19 ἀτυζόμενοι [δέ] | πτήσσον ὀξεῖαν μάχα[ν], εὔτ' ἐν πεδίῳ κλονέω[ν] μαίνονται Ἀχιλλεύς, Eur. *Her.* 974 ὄρνις ὡς ἔπτηξ, *Cycl.* 407–8, Archil. fr. 224 *IEG* πτώσσουσιν ὥστε πέρδικα. For πτήσσω with σιγῇ cf. Eur. *Or.* 777 ὑποπτήξας σιωπῇ. The redundancy in σιγῇ... ἄφωνοι recalls that of Hom. *Il.* 3.95 οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ.

STROPHIC PAIR (172–181/2 ~ 183–192/3)

(1) 172	183	— ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ —	<i>4da</i>
(2) 173	184	— ∪ — ∪ —	<i>D</i>
(3) 174	185	— ∪ — — — ∪ —	<i>e—e</i>
(4) 175	186	— — — — — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ —	<i>—e—D—</i>
(5) 176	187	— — — — — ∪ — — — — ∪ —	<i>—e—e—e</i>
(6) 177	188	— ∪ — ∪ —	<i>D</i>
(7) 178	189	— — ∪ — — — ∪ — ∪ —	<i>—e—D</i>
(8) 179	190	— — ∪ — — — ∪ — ∪ —	<i>—e—D</i>
(9) 180/1	191/2	— — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ —	<i>—e×D</i>
(10) 181/2	192/3	— ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — —	<i>e~d—</i>

The stanza exemplifies ‘fully developed dactylo-epitrite of the Pindaric type’ (L. Parker (1997) 88), involving predominantly long anceps and lack of resolution. But the metre is not simply ‘Pindaric’ in quality. The description by Dale (1950) 148 = (1969) 60 is worth quoting in full: ‘The thrice-recurring iambelegus [i.e. $\times e \times D$] is a familiar colon in dramatic lyric outside dactylo-epitrite; the opening rhythm is a dactylic “series”, and [$-e-e-e$] has the form of a lyric iambic trimeter; the clausula is an aeolic enneasyllable like the hipponactean. The whole effect, though most of it can be expressed in dactylo-epitrite symbols, is singularly different from dactylo-epitrite written in the periodic style.’ This should warn us against using metre as a sign that S. is evoking Pindar.

Willink (2002) 50–1 = (2010) 382–3 takes (5)–(7) as a single verse, for two reasons: the ‘rhetorical unity’ in the strophe (lacking in the antistrophe) and ‘the unusual absence of penthemimeral or hepthemimeral caesura when [(5)] is lineated as an iambic trimeter’. But the resulting long verse contains a section — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — unparalleled in the ode, and obliterates the three successive iambelegi in (7)–(9) (for this colon in S. and Euripides see L. Parker (1966) 9). And while lyric iambic trimeters normally have a caesura, several would need emending if we outlawed its absence (cf. Diggle (1991) 138 n. 18, (1994) 475–6 n. 158). In any case, rules for lyric iambs do not apply to dactylo-epitrites.

EPODE (194a–200)

(11) 194a	— ∪ — ∪ —	<i>D</i>
(12) 194b	∪ — ∪ — — ∪	<i>ia_^ia_^</i>
(13) 195	— — — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ^H	<i>gl ia</i>
(14) 196	— — — ∪ — ∪ —	<i>gl</i>
(15) 197	— — — ∪ — ∪ — — ∪ ^H	<i>tel_^ia_^</i>
(16) 198	— — — ∪ — ∪ — — —	<i>enopl —</i>
(17) 199	— — ∪ — — —	<i>ia_^ia_^</i>
(18) 199/200	— — ∪ — — — ∪ ^H	<i>tel (dragged)</i>
(19) 200	∪ — ∪ — — —	<i>tel (dragged)</i>

The colon in (12) and (17) is common in S.: see my metrical analysis of *El.* 504–15. The glyconic followed by iambic in (13) can be seen as a relation of the common ‘glyc — —’ (*El.* 139n.; thus Willink (2002) 52 = (2010) 385).

The succession of cola ending in three long syllables in (15)–(19) recalls *El.* 504–15 and *OC* 1239–48 (so Dale (1936) 189 = (1969) 9); all these are epodes, where ‘the degree of repetition is in marked contrast to Sophocles’ antistrophic technique’ (*ibid.* 189 = 8). For the colon in (15) cf. 1191 ~ 1198, *Ant.* 845/6 ~ 864/5, *OC* 1248. For parallels for the enoplian colon in (16) see Itsumi (1991–3) 246.

The epode ends with twin clausulae, for which Dale (1936) 188 = (1969) 7 compares *Tr.* 223–4 and 894–5. Willink (2002) 52 = (2010) 385 is overly sceptical of the phenomenon; his preferred solution involves an unattractive monometer βαρυσάλγητα, as well as the removal of the characteristically Sophoclean colon in (17).

172–5 ἡ ῥά σε Ταυροπόλα Διὸς Ἄρτεμις – ὦ μεγάλα φάτις, ὦ | μᾶτερ αἰσχύνας ἐμᾶς – | ὥρμασε πανδάμους ἐπὶ βοῦς ἀγελαίας ‘Was it Artemis Tauropola, the daughter of Zeus – o mighty rumour, o mother of my shame – who drove you against the public herds of cattle?’ The interrupting invocatory parenthesis marks the shift from recited anapaests to the emotionally heightened world of lyric. The rumour is ‘mother’ of the chorus’s shame because it gives rise to it; this standard metaphorical sense (cf. *Phil.* 1360–1 ἡ γνώμη κακῶν | μήτηρ, Aesch. *Sept.* 224–5, Theogn. 384–5 πενίην | μητέρ’ ἀμυχανίης, Chantraine (1946–7) 239) is given new life by being put in the vocative. The implied personification of the rumour (*El.* 1066n., Eur. *Hipp.* 129–30 ὅθεν μοι | πρῶτα φάτις ἦλθε δεσποίνας, Hom. *Il.* 2.93–4 with Erbse (1986) 34–5) makes it more dynamic, and more threatening, than at 141–53. (Wærn (1951) 91–2 is probably right, against A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 124, to deny that this and other such passages are kennings (i.e. ‘riddling periphrastic description[s]’, A/O; cf. West (2007) 81–3), since μήτηρ so commonly denotes origin; moreover, it is a poor riddle whose answer (φάτις) precedes the puzzle.)

Common in epic, ῥά occurs in tragedy only here, 177 (ἡ ῥά), 954/5 (ἡ ῥά, introducing a strong asseveration: Denniston 284), and Aesch. *Pers.* 633 (ἡ ῥά beginning a lyric after an anapaestic sequence and introducing a question, as in our passage). For the bare genitive Διὸς denoting paternity cf. 401a, 450, 952, 1302.

The epithet Tauropolos may have been chosen because of the perceived association between ταυρο- and βοῦς (175; thus Willink (1998) 718 n. 5 = (2010) 270 n. 5). The temple to Artemis Tauropolos (usually two-termination; cf. Wackernagel (1926–8) II 49–50 = (2009) 461–2) in the Attic deme Halai Araphenides (Strabo 9.1.22; a terracotta votive plaque of c. 500 BC from the vicinity depicts the goddess (Steinhauer (2002) 127)) was the centre of ‘a local

festival but one that attracted celebrants from all Attica' (R. Parker (1996) 26, citing *SEG* 34 §103.15–16, a deme decree from c. 350–300 BC; cf. Furlley on Men. *Epit.* 451), although we know little about it (cf. Parker (2005) 241). Euripides conflates Artemis Tauropolos with the Taurian Artemis (whose image was brought to Greece by Orestes) at *IT* 1456–7 Ἄρτεμιν δὲ νιν βροτοὶ | τὸ λοιπὸν ὑμνήσουσι Ταυροπόλον θεάν, perhaps inventing the association (cf. Dunn (2000) 19–21). Cults also existed at Amphipolis and Icaria (cf. Diod. 18.4.5, Strabo 14.1.19, Dunn (2000) 20 n. 33). She appears in a threatening oath at Ar. *Lys.* 447–8. See further Lloyd-Jones (1983) 96–7 = (1990b) 321–2, Guarisco (2001) 65–8, Dillon (2002) 127–8, and (for the association of Artemis and madness) Mattes (1970) 42–3.

πανδόμεους 'indicates that the herds belong as booty to the commonalty of the Greek host' (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 129); cf. κτήνη . . . δημιοπληθέα in that passage (oracular language denoting people: cf. Lloyd-Jones (1960) 76–8 = (1990a) 305–6) and 146n.

176 ἢ πού τινος νίκας ἀκαρπώτου χάριν 'perhaps because of some success not followed by an offering'. Failure to sacrifice to a deity (whether intentional or not) could result in dire punishment: cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.533–40 (Oeneus fails to sacrifice to Artemis, who retaliates by sending the Calydonian Boar), Eur. *Hipp.* 145–7, Davies (2010) 332 n. 2. Ironically, Ajax earlier promised a thank-offering to a goddess for her supposed assistance (91–3); ironically too, the audience learns later that Ajax's offence is not failure to acknowledge divine help, but determination to reject it (748–83n.).

Zu's ἢ for manuscript ἥ (cf. 102n.) is conjectured by Lachmann (1818) 260 = (1876) 14 and Reisig (1818) 260. (According to Pearson and L. Porciani *ap.* Ferrari *et al.* (1992) 394, V has ἥ; Dawe cites the reading from 'rec'.) When ἢ πού introduces a question (as here) or a statement (as at 382, 622/3, 850, 1008, 1229), 'the hesitation implied by πού imposes a slight check on the certainty implied by ἢ' (Denniston 286; cf. Wakker (1997) 221–2). For tragic parallels for repetition of ἢ (from 172) see Denniston 281. (Their syntactic prominence justifies talk of repetition, despite the gap.) ἢ would have to co-ordinate with ἢ in 179, which is difficult because ἢ . . . εἴτε in 177–8 (n.) introduces two possibilities subordinate to 176.

ἀκαρπώτου for transmitted ἀκαρπώτων is owed to Johnson (p. 235); for the error (perhaps encouraged by the case of the following noun) see 134–5n. Transmitted 'for the not-followed-by-an-offering sake of a victory' seems an enallage too far. Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 677–9 notes how 'prepositional χάριν "for the sake of", originally an internal acc<usative> "as an act of grace for", is once or twice qualified', citing *IT* 566 κακῆς γυναικὸς χάριν ἄχαριν ἀπώλετο, Pl. *Leg.* 853d ὧν δὴ χάριν οὐκ ἐπίχαριν λέγοιμ' ἂν πρῶτον νόμον ἱερῶν περὶ συλήσεων, Pind. *O.* 10.78 ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν | νίκας ἀγερώχου, and

our passage (unemended). In the first two instances the adjective is a prefixed form of χάριν (and in the latter passage might go with νόμον, not χάριν); in the third, ἐπωνυμίαν can take a genitive (cf. *P* 1.30–1), which eases the construction. In another passage, *Tr* 485–6 κείνου τε καὶ σὴν ἐξ Ἰσού κοινήν χάριν | . . . στέργε τὴν γυναῖκα, the phrase κοινήν χάριν assists the rhetoric: Lichas makes his request for the sake of both Heracles and Deianira, and their continuing union. None of this proves that χάριν ‘for the sake of’ can be qualified by just any adjective.

Dawe, *STS* 1 133, makes the right choice for the wrong reason. He claims that in such parallels χάριν is (in the words of Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 752–7) ‘an internal acc<usative> (of the kind often called “in apposition to the sentence”), specifying that in which the action of a verb consists or results’ (*El.* 130n.), and cites *Tr* 485 and Eur. *IT* 566. But his translations ‘She died, a favour for an evil woman’ and ‘Be nice to the woman, as a favour to him and to yourself as well’ are less natural than e.g. ‘She died for the wretched sake of a wicked woman’ (Kovacs) or ‘for Heracles’ sake and your own no less, | Accept this girl’ (Raeburn).

177–8 ἡ ῥα κλυτῶν ἐνάρων | ψευσθεῖς ὁδῶροις εἴτ’ ἐλαφαβολαῖς; ‘either because she was cheated of glorious spoils, or as a consequence of a deer hunt from which she received no gift?’ For the offering of battle spoils to a deity cf. Hom. *Il.* 10.570–1 νηῖ δ’ ἐνὶ πρυμνῇ ἔναρα βροτόεντα Δόλωνος | θῆκε Ὀδυσσεύς, ὅφρ’ ἱρὸν ἐτοίμασσαιατ’ Ἀθήνη, Hdt. 8.122, A. Jackson (1991), Rabe (2008) 15–19. For hunters’ offerings to Artemis see Meuli (1946) 263 n. 5, (1967) 159 = (1975) π 991–2 n. 6, 1086 n. 2. For the linking of a participle with the equivalent of a prepositional phrase cf. Eur. *Held.* 194–5, Diggle (1972) 242 = (1994) 52–3.

‘The words ἡ . . . χάριν [176] suppose the general reason for the anger of Artemis, while ἡ ῥα . . . εἴτ’ splits up this general reason into two possibilities’ (Kamerbeek, *prob.* Willink (1998) 717–18 n. 4 = (2010) 269–70 n. 4; Whitelaw first advocates this articulation, his translation, p. 440). For ἡ . . . εἴτε with this function cf. Eur. *Alc.* 112–17 ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ναυκληρίαν | ἔσθ’ ὅποι τις αἰῶς | στείλας, ἡ Λυκίαν | εἴτ’ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνύδρους | † Ἀμμωνιάδας ἔδρας, † | δυσπᾶνου παραλύσαι | ψυχάν; also Hom. *Od.* 21.397–9 ἡ τις θηητήρ καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπὸς ἔπλετο τόξων. | ἡ ῥα νύ που τοιαῦτα καὶ αὐτῷ οἴκοι κείται, | ἡ ὁ γ’ ἐφορμάται ποιησέμεν. In the latter passage, as in our own, the initial clause begins with ἡ, and ῥα appears after the word for ‘either’. Erfurdt cites a second parallel (albeit without initial ἡ): *Il.* 21.61–3 ὅφρα ἴδωμαι ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἡδὲ δαείω | ἡ’ [i.e. ἡ ἐlided] ἄρ’ ὁμῶς καὶ κείθεν ἐλεύσεται, ἡ μιν ἐρύξει | γῆ φυσίζοος [West: ἡ’ . . . ἡ Fick (1885–6) 63: ἡ . . . ἡ Allen]. As Denniston 284 notes, ‘Homeric ἡ, ἡε, in the second limb of a disjunctive interrogative or deliberative sentence (direct or indirect) stands for the disjunctive ἡ, ἡε’

(cf. Praetorius (1873) 17–24, West (2001a) 235). εἴτε ἄρα... εἴτε (or ἤ) is also attested from Homer onwards (Denniston 42).

Hermann (1808) 174–5 = (1827) 201–2 reinterprets ἡ ῥα to give ἥρα, now attested in the sense of χάρις as early as Bacchylides (11.21; further instances in Ll-J/W, *Sō*). For Hermann, ἡ πού... ψευσθεῖς is one alternative, followed by ἄδωροις εἴτ' ἐλαφβολίαις as the other. But the reason for his reinterpretation (stated in his editions), that ῥα never follows ἡ in the second colon of a disjunction, is irrelevant, since by reading ἡ... ἡ ῥα... εἴτε we have ἡ ῥα in the first colon, for which there are two Homeric parallels. Even without them, ῥα is too rare in tragedy (172–5n.) to allow generalisations on its use in disjunctive questions. After we answer Hermann's objections to ῥα, nothing commends his reinterpretation. It gives the clumsy 'cheated on account of the glorious spoils', instead of 'cheated of the glorious spoils', with the bare genitive regular with this verb (cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. ψεύδω A 12). Moreover, it creates a lopsided pair of alternatives, the former much the longer; and ἥρα is inelegant straight after χάρις in the same sense (thus Easterling (1994) 188).

Ll-J/W print Hermann's reinterpretation, asking rhetorically (*Sō*) 'where before Nonnus, *Dion.* 38.300 is there an instance of ἡ in the sense of *or* followed by ῥα?' But as noted above (and by L. Porciani *ap.* Ferrari *et al.* (1992) 394, whom Ll-J/W misinterpret in *ST*), if we print ἡ in 176 (as Ll-J/W do), then ἡ means 'either', not 'or'. Their paraphrase in *Sō*, 'Has Artemis, the Chorus is asking, been denied a share of the fruits of victory, either in battle or in the chase?', corresponds not to their articulation, but to Whitelaw's.

For the dative of cause ἄδωροις... ἐλαφβολίαις cf. 531, 1382, Moorhouse 89. ψευσθεῖς ἄδωροις is owed to Stephanus for the unintelligible ψευσθεῖσα δώροις. Errors of word division (cf. 212, 224/5, *579, *620/1, 1000, 1056, *1075, 1248, *1284) often involve elision, as in the present case and the starred instances.

ἐλαφβόλος is an epithet for Artemis in myth and cult (examples at Bremmer (2002) 26 n. 25). ἐλαφβολίαις is owed to Linwood¹; **a** have ἐλαφβολίαις, while LK have the unmetrical ἐλαφαβολείαις. The alpha vocalism is preferable (cf. Björck (1950) 168); manuscripts are split at *Tr.* 213/14, but at *OR* 162 ἐκαβόλον is the dominant reading.

179–181/2 ἡ χαλκοθώραξ εἴ τιν' Ἐνυάλιος | μομφὰν ἔχων ξυνοῦ δορός ἐννυχίοις | μαχαναῖς ἐτείσατο λῶβαν; 'or did Enyalios of the brazen breast-plate, having some grounds of accusation as a result of a joint exploit, avenge the outrage by a night-time stratagem?' A warrior offends the war god Enyalios through failure to acknowledge, or request, his assistance in battle (as Ajax has done in the case of the war goddess, Athena: 770–7). The alternative, that Enyalios is angry because Ajax has fought successfully against his protégés, the Trojans (which assumes an equivalence between Enyalios and Ares), is

unlikely, because it leaves ξυνοῦ with little point. Moreover, the god's specific loyalties are no more at issue here than at Eur. *Andr.* 1009–18, where Apollo is said to have abandoned Troy to destruction by Enyalios. Even in the *Iliad* Ares is ἀλλοπρῶσαλλος (5.889), no reliable supporter of either side.

εἰ for transmitted ἦ is owed to Elmsley (1805/6 edition). Explaining the transmitted text, the scholia (p. 60 Chr.) claim that the chorus distinguish Ares (χαλκοθώραξ) from Enyalios. But the adjective without the article is insufficient to designate the god (so Hermann¹; *pace* Davidson (1983) 195–6, who does not cite a tragic parallel for the usage). For elliptical εἰ τιν' (least clumsily rendered in English by taking it as equivalent to τιν') with a verb understood cf. 879/80–887/8, *Phil.* 1204–5 ξίφος, εἰ ποθεν, | ἦ γένυν, ἦ βελέων τι, προπέμψατε, Xen. *An.* 5.3.3, *Hell.* 4.2.21. The unusual syntax and prevalence of H in the vicinity would have facilitated this common error (cf. Eur. fr. 309 *TrGF*, Tr. Adesp. fr. 148, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 727). The expression also conveys the chorus's caution in ascribing to Ajax an offence against the gods (cf. 176 πού). These reasons lead me to prefer εἰ to the next most attractive alternative, σοι (thus Reiske (1753) 1 and Pierson (pre-1759) 196 verso; for the dative cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 445).

There are two less enticing possibilities. (i) Johnson (p. 235) suggests ἦντιν' ('vel nescio quam nactus querelae causam'). For ὅστις in the sense ὅστισοῦν cf. Pl. *Hipp. Mai.* 282d τούτων δ' ἑκάτερος πλέον ἀργύριον ἀπὸ σοφίας εἶργασται ἢ ἄλλος δημιουργὸς ἀφ' ἡστινος τέχνης, perhaps Call. *Hym.* 3.18 with Schneider. But this rare idiom should not be preferred when easier alternatives are available. (ii) Musgrave's μή ('can it be that . . .?', a usage which Moorhouse 320 illustrates) gives problematic word order. Of the eleven passages from tragedy cited by Diggle (1977) 117 = (1994) 160 and (1981a) 120 where μή introduces a question, only Eur. *Hipp.* 799 οἱμοι, τέκνων μοι μή τι συλᾶται βίος; and *Hec.* 1272 μορφῆς ἐπωδὸν μή (μ[η] Π; ἦ codd.) τι τῆς ἐμῆς ἐρεῖς; have μή anywhere else than first in its colon. In *Hippolytus*, delayed μή gives prominence to τέκνων, as Theseus reacts with concern to the possibility that his children are dead; while in *Hecuba* fronted μορφῆς ἐπωδὸν stresses the link (vital in an aetiological context) between Hecuba's new shape and the land named after it. In our passage, however, Enyalios' body armour hardly requires emphasis. Nor does Babbitt (1901) 307–13 cite anything comparable in his discussion of this construction with μή.

Ἐνυάλιος is probably found in a list of deities on the Linear B tablet KN V 52 (*e-nu-wa-ri-jo*). Once in Homer it provides an epithet for Ares (*Il.* 17.210–11); elsewhere, as here, it is an alternative name for him (cf. *Il.* 13.519, [Hes.] *Scut.* 371, Archil. fr. 1.1 *IEG*, Pind. fr. 70b.16–17 S–M, Eur. *Andr.* 1015–16, Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.17). But Aristophanes distinguishes between Enyalios and Ares at *Pax* 457, where a scholium remarks that, 'as some say', Alcman did too (fr. 44 *PMGF*); and the two are distinct in cult (see Gonzales (2008) 131–2).

The Athenian Ephebic oath cited Enyalios (together with Ares; cf. R. Parker (2005) 398 with n. 42), and, according to Plutarch, his precinct stood on Salamis (*Sol.* 9.7). The breastplate (described by Olson on Ar. *Pax* 1224–5) is part of his accoutrement at Pind. fr. 169a.12 S–M χαλκοθώρακος Ἐνυαλίου, Hor. *C.* 1.6.13 *Martem tunica tectum adamantina* (see Nisbet and Hubbard). The adjective occurs elsewhere at Hom. *Il.* 4.448, 8.62 (χαλκεοθώραξ, predicated of warriors), Pind. fr. 52b.1 S–M (*Paean* 2) (of Abderus), Bacchyl. 11.123 (the Atridae), Theocr. 22.136 (of Castor). Ares was not worshipped much at Athens, though there was a festival, but no temple, in his honour at Acharnae (see R. Parker (2005) 398 with n. 43). ξυνός is found elsewhere in tragedy only at Aesch. *Suppl.* 367 (ξυνῆ); it is predicated of Enyalios at Hom. *Il.* 18.309 in a different sense (‘impartial’). At Eur. *Phoen.* [1572] κοινὸν ἔνυάλιον means ‘(waging) mutual battle’.

For μομφὴν ἔχω ‘I have cause to reproach’ cf. Eur. *Or.* 1069, [Aesch.] *PV* 445 (μέμψις), Ar. *Pax* 664, Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 773.

μυχαναΐς is in all manuscripts except H and Monac. gr. 507, which read μη-. (Editors attribute the reading to Wolff, but the latter manuscript’s testimony was published by Erfurd before he was born.) The word occurs five times elsewhere in tragic lyric: *Ant.* 349, Aesch. *Pers.* 113, *Suppl.* 1073, and Eur. *Or.* 1423 have μηχ- in all available witnesses, while Aesch. *Sept.* 132 has μυχ-. In his edition of Aeschylus (pp. xxv–xxvi), West notes that we should be consistent for a given word across all its instances in that poet; and that when the manuscripts conflict, we should prefer alpha, since the practice of glossing Doric alpha with superscript eta makes corruption from alpha to eta the more likely alternative. He thus prints μυχ- in all three Aeschylean cases. Hence I print μυχ- here and at *Ant.* 349. In the latter, the proximity of *Ant.* 363 ἀμυχανών and 365 μυχανόνεω may have facilitated the error. It remains possible that S. wrote μηχ- in both. Other forms derived from this stem always have eta in tragic lyric (cf. Björck (1959) 178–9), but different words from the same stem follow different patterns (West xxvii–xxviii). It may be significant that we have two instances of μυχανά with alpha, out of only six cases, whereas there are none with alpha from the two dozen or so instances of related words.

ἐτίεσατο for transmitted ἐτίσατο is owed to Nauck⁹ (cf. 112–13n.).

183–5 οὔποτε γὰρ φρενόθεν γ’ ἐπ’ ἀριστερά, παῖ Τελαμώνος, ἔβας | τόσσον ἐν ποίμναις πίτνων. ‘For it was not of your own accord, son of Telamon, that you went so far astray as to fall on the flocks.’ Indeed not; but he was sane when he tried to attack the army. The chorus are not aware that Ajax’s madness affected only the identity of the eventual victims, not the initial impulse to go on the mission. οὔποτε is a strong negative (Ll–J/W, *So.*, comparing Eur. *Tro.* 766 ὦ Τυνδάρειον ἔρνος, οὔποτ’ εἰ Διός). Jebb translates ‘never . . . wouldst thou have gone . . .’, but that requires ἄν (hence τᾶν Dawe, *STS* 1 133–4; γ’

ἄν Ll-J/W, *So.*). The transmitted text contrasts the chorus's statements about Ajax (confident indicatives) and, in 186, divine activity (cautious optative plus ἄν). For two successive γάρ-clauses, both with the same reference (but here with 'a negative argument reinforced by a positive one'), see Denniston 64.

Unusual actions may indicate aberrant mental states: cf. Hom. *Il.* 24.201–2 (Hecuba to Priam) ὦμοι, πῇ δὴ τοι φρένες οἴχονθ', ἥς τὸ πάρος περ | ἐκλε' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ξείνους ἡδ' οἷσιν ἀνάσσεις; Archil. fr. 172.1–3 *IEG* πότερ Λυκάμβα, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε; | τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας | ἥς τὸ πρὶν ἡρήρησθα; Enn. *Ann.* 199–200 Skutsch *quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant | antehac, dementes sese flexere* ἴνιαι. For φρήν 'used for the essential character of a person, a race or a sex' (Solmsen (1984) 268) cf. 445, 482.

Doing something ἐπ' ὀριστερά (or ἐπαρ–), literally 'leftwards', is to get it wrong: cf. Ar. *Az.* 1567, Ephippus fr. 23 *PCG*, Theognetus fr. 1.7 *PCG*, σκαῖός (1225, LSJ⁹ s.v. iii), G. Lloyd (1962) 58, Humer (2006) 67–71.

The epic forms τόσσος, ὄσσος occur elsewhere in tragedy at Aesch. *Pers.* 864 and Eur. *Suppl.* 58 (both lyric; see further Sideras (1971) 116–17 with n. 98). Most manuscripts have the unmetrical τόσσον; for the error, and the reverse, see Fraenkel on the *Agamemnon* passage. Epic double sigmas occur twice elsewhere in this play, in the aorist (388–91n.) and future (925/6–928/9n.) stems.

Zc's ποίμναις (*coni.* Triclinius) may be a metrical emendation for the impossible ποίμναισι. K's πῖτνων (*coni.* Elmsley, 1805/6 ed.) has the correct accentuation (56–8n.). Hartung's πῖτνειν could be right, manuscript distinctions between –ων and –ειν often being casual; but for a participle where we might expect a final-consecutive infinitive Schneidewin compares *Ant.* 752 ἡ κάπα-πτελῶν ὧδ' ἐπεξέρχῃ θρασύς;

186 ἦκοι γὰρ ἂν θεία νόσος. 'A divine sickness may have come' (Campbell, *PS*; cf. Moorhouse 231). For madness sent by the gods in tragedy see 59–60n. 'The potential opt<ative> with ἂν signifies what may be or is probably the case' (FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 458; cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1508 πατρόθεν δὲ συλλήπτωρ γένοιτ' ἂν ἁλάστωρ, where the sense 'could have been' is clear). Jebb's alternative 'must come' (*prob.* Pritchett (1955) 14) is as mistaken as his interpretation of 88 (n.). For γάρ see the previous n.

186–7 ἀλλ' ἀπερύκοι | καὶ Ζεὺς κακὰν καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀργείων φάτιν. 'but may Zeus and Phoebus Apollo ward off the evil rumour of the Argives.' By requesting divine assistance against the rumour, not the disease (cf. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 22–3; contrast 949), the chorus prepare for the transition to the next and final section, in which they again take Ajax's misfortunes to be the result of malicious gossip rather than his own actions. The chorus appeal to Zeus in his apotropaic function (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 255 ὦ παγκρατὲς Ζεῦ, τρέψον εἰς ἐχθροὺς βέλως, Cook (1914–40) II/2 1099 n. 1, 1156–7 n. 13, III/2 1187); distinguish him from Zeus Tropaῖos, who put armies to flight (cf. *Tr.* 303–5,

Ant. 143, *Eur. Huld.* 867, *El.* 671). Apollo is the apotropaic god *par excellence* (cf. *IG II-III²* 1358.26, *SEG* 21 §541.A.32–4, both Attica, first half of 4th c., and R. Parker (1983) 334–5); cf. the frequent comic (and real life?) exclamation Ἀπολλὸν ἀποτροπάει (*Ar. Vesp.* 161, *Av.* 61, *Plut.* 359, 854, perhaps *Com. Adesp.* fr. 1060.2 *PCG (suppl.)*, *Eur. Her.* 538 with Bond; also [*Theogn.*] 773–6 Φοῖβε ἄναξ... ἀπέρυκε). The adjective κακάν and noun φάτιν are split between balanced clauses (cf. *El.* 780–1, *Ant.* 205–6, Bruhn §167.11).

188–192/3 Silence gives credibility to one’s accuser: cf. *Tr.* 813–14 τί σῖγ’ ἀφέρπεις; οὐ κάτοισθ’ ὀθούνεκα | ξυνηγορεῖς σιγῶσα τῷ κατηγορῶ; fr. 928.2 *TrGF* ἢ γὰρ σιωπῇ τῷγκαλοῦντι [*Cobet*: τῷ λαλοῦντι *codd.*] σύμμαχος, *Eur. IA* 1142, fr. 1037 *TrGF*.

188–90 εἰ δ’ ὑποβαλλόμενοι | κλέπτουσι μύθους οἱ μεγάλοι βασιλῆς | χῶ τᾶς ἀσώτου Σισυφιδᾶν γενεᾶς ‘But if the mighty kings, and the man who belongs to the reprobate race of the Sisyphids, deceitfully spread false stories’. For ὑποβάλλομαι ‘deceive’ cf. *OC* 794 (Oedipus to Creon) τὸ σὸν δ’ ἀφίεται δεῦρ’ ὑπόβλητον στόμα. Normally the word denotes passing off what is not one’s own as if it were, the usage originating in women’s practice of secretly placing other people’s children at their breast to mask their own childlessness (cf. L. Parker on *Eur. Alc.* 639, A/O on *Ar. Thesm.* 339–41). So at 481 ὑπόβλητον λόγον the sense is ‘these words are the genuine Ajax, not the mad Ajax we saw earlier’, as Eustathius recognised: ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ὑποβολιμαίους εἶπε λόγους τοὺς μὴ γνησίους τῆς σώφρονος διανοίας, ἀλλὰ νόθους (106.7 = 1 165.10–11 Van der Valk)... ὑπόβλητον λέξει λόγον ὁμοίως τὸν καὶ ὑποβολιμαῖον (503.40 = 1 796.16). But in 188 the kings are not passing off other people’s words as their own; the emphasis falls on their deceit. This general sense develops from the more specific.

For κλέπτω ‘effect by stealth’ cf. 1137, *El.* 37n. The correct orthography βασιλῆς (for which see Herodian 1 430.2 Lentz, Wecklein (1869) 20–1, Threatte II 239–48) is corrupted in most manuscripts to –εῖς, with further minority variants –ῆς and –ῆες (cf. 863, 959).

The insulting ascription of Odysseus’ paternity to Sisyphus (first attested at Aesch. *Hopl. Krisis* fr. 175 *TrGF*; cf. Olson on *Ach.* 391–2) is absent from Homer (cf. Kelly (2007) 277 n. 1 *bis*), who nevertheless knows of his cunning (*Il.* 6.153 Σίσυφος... ὃ κέρδιστος γένετ’ ἀνδρῶν, where see Stoevesandt). The chorus’s elaborate expression is both more appropriate to lyric and a more magnificent expression of contempt. Σισυφίδος (*coni.* Lobeck¹) gives ‘the son of Sisyphus, who belongs to that reprobate race’, but the stress on the plurality of the Sisyphids adds (irrationally) to the sense of menace, as if Sisyphus and Odysseus were merely the latest incarnations of a dastardly lineage.

χῶ for ἦ is implied by a scholium in J cited by Lobeck (τινὲς προσθήασιν τὸ ἄρθρον ἐν τῇ συντάξει ἐπὶ τῆς ἀσώτου Σισυφιδᾶν γενεᾶς, οὕτω λέγοντες· εἰ

δὲ κλέπτουσιν οἱ μεγάλοι βασιλεῖς καὶ ὁ ἐκ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς ἀσώτου καταγόμενος Ὀδυσσεύς). Crasis often causes error (39n.), and ἡ mistakenly replaces a monosyllable earlier in the ode (179). καί also improves the sense: the chorus should no more distinguish between Atreids and Odysseus here than Ajax does at 387–91. Original χώ, written καὶ ὁ by *scriptio plena*, could have become ἡ by a minuscule error (*El.* 312n.) followed by loss of the article. The transmitted text requires βασιλεύς to be understood, which is clumsy. Johnson's ἡ παῖς (p. 235) was rejected by B. Heath (1762) 4 on the ground that one cannot be the παῖς of a γενεά.

191/2–192/3 μὴ μὴ, ἄναξ, ἔθ' ὧδ' ἐφάλοισ κλισίαις | ὄμ' ἔχων κακὰν φάτιν ἄρη. 'Do not, do not, lord, keep your face hidden in your hut by the sea like this any longer and gain an evil reputation.' For repeated μὴ conveying an urgent negative request cf. *OC* 209/10 μὴ μὴ μ' ἀνέρη, *Ar. Vesp.* 1418, Meleager *A.P.* 12.80.3 = 4084 *HE* μὴ μὴ πρὸς σε Διός, μὴ πρὸς Διός. The datives are locative (cf. K–G I 441–3, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 69), not final-directive (cf. Moorhouse 80, 87), since Ajax is in his hut, not looking at it; Hor. *C.* 3.29.5–7 *eripe te morae, | nec semper udum Tibur et Aefulae | declive contempleris arvum* is a specious parallel. For Ajax's ὄμω see 167–8n.

μὴ μὴ, ἄναξ for transmitted μὴ μὴ μ' (simplified to μὴ μ' in GOV) is owed to Blaydes¹. Since μοι cannot elide in tragedy, transmitted μ' would have to be με, governed by the verbal noun φάτιν, just as at *El.* 122–5 the verbal noun οἰμωγάν governs τὸν... Ἀγαμέμνονα. But this construction is remarkable enough in *Electra* without the additional problem of hyperbaton. Moreover, the chorus is now concerned with the disgrace to Ajax himself, not its own shame.

Blaydes's simple correction introduces hiatus, which in tragedy 'occurs only before and after exclamations, urgent imperatives, and the like, after τί, in the phrase εὔ ἴσθι, εὔ οἶδα, and in lyrics before enclitic οἱ [*El.* 195n.] or after ἦ' (West (1982) 15, with examples in n. 24). Cf. *OC* 1485 Ζεῦ ἄνα, σοὶ φωνῶ and 194a below, which involves an imperative (also ἄνα, though a different word). Hiatus is also standard with ἄναξ in epic, because of the original digamma; the epic features of this lyric may justify an appeal to epic prosody (cf. Wilamowitz (1883) 216–17 n. 2 = (1935–72) VI 163–4 n. 2). So too at *El.* 157 the hiatus in καὶ Ἰφιδάσσα could be influenced by epic phraseology (n.).

A different approach gives μὴ, μηκέτ', ὦναξ (Morstadt (1864) 41) or μὴ μηκέθ' ὧδ' ἄναξ (Blaydes (1899) 216, then J. Jackson (1955) 30–2). But I cannot find parallels for μὴ μηκέτι, nor for μὴ μὴν (*coni.* Kvíčala (1862) 402; μὴ μάν Willink (2002) 51 = (2010) 384).

In place of ὄμ' ἔχων Reiske (1753) 1 suggests ἐμμένων. The change removes an attractive expression: since ὄμω can mean 'source of brightness / comfort' (977, *El.* 903n.), the chorus could be stressing the deliverance which Ajax could

bring. τὸ σὸν ὄμμα at 167 (also of Ajax) further protects the text (so Dawe *ap. Willink* (2002) 51 n. 9 = (2010) 384 n. 9). For ἄρη rather than ἄρης see 75n.

194a ἀλλ' ἄνα ἐξ ἑδράνων 'Come now, up from your seat'. Three times in the *Iliad* a warrior is urged to enter battle with the phrase ἀλλ' ἄνα: 6.331 (Hector to Paris), 9.247 (Odysseus to Achilles), 18.178 (Iris to Achilles). It is also found at *Od.* 18.13 (Irus to Odysseus) and *Eur. Alc.* 277 ἀλλ' ἄνα, τόλμα (Admetus to the dying Alcestis); cf. *Aesch. Cho.* 963, where ἄνα γε μὴν (addressed by the chorus to the House of Atreus) is a possible interpretation of the manuscript (see Garvie), *Eur. Tro.* 98 ἄνα, δούσδαιμον (Hecuba to herself), possibly *Suppl.* 44 ἰάνομοι† (ἄνα μοι Brodaeus; see Diggle (1973) 241–4 = (1994) 59–62). The situation supports an Iliadic allusion here, although Ajax is urged up to defend not his fellow Greeks but himself against those supposed comrades. See further Telò (2002a) 25–6 n. 34, Nisbet and Rudd on *Hor. C.* 3.11.37 *surge*.

ἐξ ἑδράνων suggests a characteristic posture of the inactive warrior. Achilles is seated when the embassy reaches him in *Iliad* 9 (cf. 193–4 ταφῶν δ' ἀνόρουσεν Ἀχιλλεύς | . . . λιπῶν ἔδος ἔνθα θάσασσεν), while Hector during his attempt to rouse Paris is urged by Helen ἔξεο τῷδ' ἐπὶ δίφρῳ (6.354), only to reply μή με κάθιζ', Ἑλένη, φιλέουσά περ (6.360). See further 609–11n., Renehan (1984) 257–8.

For ἀλλά introducing an imperative, marking 'a transition from arguments for action to a statement of the action required' and/or 'near the end of a speech, as a clinching and final appeal' (Denniston 14) cf. 328, 344, 361, 506, 520, 565, 578, 1107, 1164, 1413. Hiatus (191/2–192/3n.) occurs after the same phrase at *Hom. Il.* 9.247.

194b–195 δπου μακράωνι | στηρίζη ποτὲ τῷδ' ἀγωνίῳ σχολῶ 'where you remain fixed in this long rest from battle'. μακράων (fronted in the clause and separated from τῷδ' ἀγωνίῳ σχολῶ for emphasis) elsewhere in S. describes either long human life (*OR* 518, *OC* 152) or the age of divinities (*Ant.* 987, *OR* 1098/9). Ajax's stay in his hut could be measured in hours, not years, but even this seems long to the chorus in the present need.

στηρίζομαι can be predicated of soldiers standing their ground (cf. *Tyrt. fr.* 10.32 = 11.22 *IEG* στηριχθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς; also *Hom. Il.* 21.241–2 οὐδὲ πτόδεσσι | εἶχε στηρίξασθαι, of Achilles confronting the river-god). Applying it to Ajax while emphasising his refusal to enter battle may be ironic, especially since such holding a defensive line is Ajax's characteristic strength in the *Iliad*. The verb is often found in conjunction with οὐρανός (cf. *Hom. Il.* 4.443 (Strife) οὐρανῶ ἐστήρικε κάρη (and, in Zenodotus' text, at 18.485), *Hes. Th.* 779 πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται, *Eur. Hipp.* 1207 κῦμ' οὐρανῷ στηρίζον; also *Ba.* 1073 ὀρθή δ' ἐς ὀρθὸν αἰθέρ' ἐστηρίζετο), and thus leads into 196.

ποτὲ emphasises the long duration of Ajax's inaction, just as it often intensifies αἶ: cf. 320, *Ant.* 456–7 αἶ ποτε | ζῆ ταῦτα ('ποτε helps the phrase to

stretch indefinitely into the past': Griffith), Eur. *Alc.* 569, *Ion* 1329, Ar. *Au.* 1545, and prose examples. Although ἄει is absent, μακροΐωνι and στηρίζη suggest a long period of time. Hermann¹ takes ὅπου and ποτέ closely together to give 'ubicumque tandem', but the imprecision, pointless in itself, coheres ill with the straightforward location specified in the previous line (cf. Dawe, *STS* 1 134). Emendations are unsatisfactory: ποσί (ποδί *iam* Markland (pre-1776), πόδα Morstadt (1864) 41) would fit with the verb (cf. Hom. *Il.* 21.241–2, *Od.* 12.434), but would suggest a standing posture, contradicting the emphasis on Ajax's sitting found in 194a (n.). Zc's ποτί (*coni.* Ritschl (1829) 36–8) shows an epic/Doric form of πρὸς which occurs in S. at fr. 245.1 *TrGF* (lyr.), and also in compounds at *Ti.* 1214, fr. 242.1 *TrGF*. But στηρίζομαι πρὸς ought to mean 'I am fixed upon', followed by e.g. γῆ (cf. *OR* 180/1–181/2 πρὸς πέδω | . . . κείται), not σχολῇ.

τῷδ' ἄγωνίῳ σχολῇ could mean 'rest from battle', 'idleness provoked by the Judgment of the Arms' (denoted by ἄγων at 936 and 1240), and 'contentious inactivity' (thus Davidson (1976) 131, and cf. Campbell's 'the inactivity of Ajax was his manner of contending with the chiefs'; Campbell sees an additional passive sense, 'however his leisure was employed, it was becoming full of danger to him'). All are probably felt in what seems one of S.'s denser phrases.

196 ἄταν οὐρανίαν φλέγων. 'ablaze with ruin that reaches heaven.' For transitive φλέγω cf. Eur. fr. 122.13 *TrGF* πολυδάκρυτον Αἶδα γόον φλέγουσαν, *Phoen.* 241 αἶμα δάιον φλέγει. Fire reaches heaven at Hom. *Il.* 8.509 σέλας δ' εἰς οὐρανὸν ἵκη, but the expression may also pervert the epic motif whereby a man's κλέος is thus exalted (cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.20 καὶ μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει, *Il.* 8.192, Ar. *Nub.* 460/1, Kelly (2007) 213). For οὐράνιος in this sense see LSJ⁹ s.v. II; but the alternative 'heaven-sent' may also be felt by the audience, who know of Athena's involvement in Ajax's ruin. Either is possible at *Ant.* 418 οὐράνιον ἄχος and Aesch. *Pers.* 573 οὐράνι ἄχη (where see Garvie).

197–8 ἔχθρων δ' ὕβρις ᾧδ' ἀτάρβητα | ὀρμαῖται ἐν εὐανέμοις βάσσαις 'But the wanton violence of your enemies rushes fearlessly in this way among the windswept glens.' Troy is 'windswept' in Homer (*Il.* 3.305 etc.). The picture implies an assimilation of ὕβρις (151–3n.) to fire (Σ p. 67 Chr. λείπει τὸ ὡς πῦρ), for which cf. 1088 αἰθων ὕβριστής, Heracl. D–K 22 B 43 (1 160.12) ὕβριν χρῆ σβεννύναι μάλλον ἢ πυρκαϊήν. For fire in the mountains urged on by the wind cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.490–3 ὡς δ' ἀναμαιμάει βαθεῖ ἄγκρα θεσπιδαῖς πῦρ | οὐρεος ἐζαλαίοιο, βαθεῖα δὲ καίεται ὕλη, | πάντῃ τε κλονέων ἄνεμος φλόγα εἰλυφάζει, | ὡς ὃ γε πάντῃ θῦνε σὺν ἔγχεϊ δαίμονι Ἴσος; also 14.396–8 οὔτε πυρὸς τόσσος γε ποτὶ βρόμος αἰθόμενιο | οὐρεος ἐν βήσσης, ὅτε τ' ὦρετο καίμεν ὕλην, | οὔτ' ἄνεμος. Willink (2002) 53 = (2010) 386 objects that 'the εὐ-element sits oddly in the supposed comparison with a forest fire'; see however Pyne *et al.* (1996) 168 on how 'strong, gusty, shifting winds . . . set the stage for

extreme fire behavior'. For the sense here cf. fr. 371.2 *TrGF* ('the windswept waters': Lloyd-Jones); also Hom. *Od.* 19.432 πτύχας ἠνεμοέσσας.

ἀτάρβητα is metrically preferable to ἀτάρβηθ' (Hermann¹) as it gives a colon ending in three longs (no other colon in the epode ends in only two); and if the final two longs are felt as a syncopated iambic, this fits with cola in 194b, 197, and 199. Willink (2002) 52 = (2010) 385 objects to the resulting *brevis in longo* without sense-pause, but this phenomenon is hardly so predictable. For the neuter plural of an adjective used adverbially with a verb of motion cf. *OR* 883–4 εἰ δέ τις ὑπέροπτα χερσὶν | ἧ λόγῳ πορεύεται, *OC* 1695/6–1696 οὔτοι κατάμεμπτ' ἔβητον, Eur. *Ba.* 435, Pind. *O.* 7.45. A few manuscripts (plus the *Suda* α 4320 = 1399.27–8 Adler, in lemma and quotation, and Zonaras 1338 Tittmann, s.v. ἀταρβήτως) have ἀταρβήτως (sometimes as a gloss), but for adverbs in –ως as glosses replacing original adverbial neuter plurals see Pearson (1919) 118 (also 28n.). Dindorf¹ prints ἀτάρβητος, which according to Brunck has manuscript support, but again this is probably a gloss.

Only Triclinius has ὀρμᾶται, with ὀρμᾶτ' in the other manuscripts (the active variant ὀρμᾷ is impossible, and perhaps results from misreading of the elided middle). A mark in T over the –αι indicates a short syllable (*teste* Dawe, *STS* 119), and so does not represent *scriptio plena*. For incorrect elision of –αι in manuscripts (illicit in tragedy: *El.* 715n.) cf. Willink (2002) 52–3 n. 11 = (2010) 385 n. 11.

εὐάνμοις with a short second syllable gives a colon x—υ—υ—υ—x— as exemplified by Itsumi (1991–3) (especially 246), whereas the colon resulting from a long is obscure. Normally we expect a long alpha in εὐάνεμος, as with (probably) fr. 371.2 *TrGF* (lyr.) εὐάνεμος (with Snell's metrical scheme, printed by Radt), *Ant.* 590/1 δυσάνεμος, Bacchyl. 6.13 ποδάνεμος (see Björck (1950) 167 on the preference for long alpha over eta in these forms). The adjective also has a metrically guaranteed long vowel in its appearances in tragic dialogue (Eur. *Andr.* 749, fr. 316.2 *TrGF*); cf. also *OC* 677 ἀνήνεμον (lyr.), *Ant.* 411 ὑπήνεμος, *Tr.* 327 διήνεμος (all guaranteed). But for the short Dale (1971–83) 115 compares *Phil.* 828/9 εὐαῆς (so Hermann for manuscript εὐαῆς; either could be right) and (more helpfully) the pair ἀνάριθμος, ἀνήριθμος; see further *El.* 1394n. for compounds with a short vowel instead of the expected long in tragic lyric. εὐάνεμος with a short alpha is found in later Greek at Crinagoras *A.P.* 9.555.6 = 1952 *GP*.

199–199/200 πάντων καχάζόντων | γλώσσαις βαρυάλγητα: 'while all men make grievous mockery with their tongues.' For καχάζω 'of triumphant or insulting laughter' see Gow on Theocr. 5.142. For γλώσσαις in the context of mockery Willink (2002) 53 = (2010) 386 compares *Ant.* 962 ἐν κερτομίσις γλώσσαις. 'Jeering naturally combines laughter and speech... it is a pity [by adopting the minority variant βακχαζόντων] to eliminate the laughter

that is so regularly associated with *hybris* in this play’ (Garvie). In support of βακχαζόντων, Ferrari (1983) 24–5 cites the description of Capaneus at *Ant.* 135–7 πυρφόρος δς τότε μαινομένην ξὺν ὀρμῇ | βακχεύων ἐπέπνει | ῥιπαῖς ἐχθίστων ἀνέμων; but this fits an ode in which Dionysus himself makes an entrance (153/4–154). In our passage a Bacchic reference would stand isolated.

καχαζόντων (*coni.* Dindorf, p. x) gives better metre than transmitted καγχαζόντων, and has stronger support among other occurrences of the word (Finglass (2009g) 221–2). Some editors print βαρυάληγτ’, but this ‘impossibly gives elision at “pendant close before anceps”, i.e. at a period-end’ (Willink (2002) 52 n. 10 = (2010) 385 n. 10, referring to Stinton (1977b) 39 = (1990) 326 ‘pendant close is always a mark of period-end, if it is followed by a short or anceps’; cf. the similar doubts of Lourenço (1999) 455–6).

200 ἐμοὶ δ’ ἄχος ἔστακεν. ‘But for me, pain stands firm.’ The chorus’s distress caused by Ajax’s apparently immovable resolve (195 στηρίζη) is appropriately conveyed through another verb expressing a fixed state (cf. 1084), though not as emphatic as the protagonist’s. For ‘standing’ predicated of grief cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 416 ἀπέστασεν ἄχος, Pind. fr. 210.2 S–M ἵστασιν ἄλγος ἐμφανές, Lucian 44.6 καὶ σφίσι μεγάλα πένθηα . . . ἵσταται. A similar metaphorical use involves sitting; cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 982–3 θάρσος εὐπειθεὶς ἵξει [Scaliger: ἵξει vel ἵξει codd.] φρενὸς φίλον θρόνον, *Eum.* 517–19 ἔσθ’ ὅπου τὸ δεινὸν εὖ, | καὶ φρενῶν ἐπίσκοπον | δεῖ μένειν [Anon.: δειμαίνει codd.] καθήμενον, Eur. *Alc.* 604–5 πρὸς δ’ ἐμὰ ψυχὰ θάρσος ἦσται | θεοσεβῆ φῶτα κεδνὰ πρᾶξειν.

FIRST EPISODE, PART ONE (201–347)

201–62 The chorus have begged Ajax to show himself; the door of the skene opens; and out comes – a woman. Ajax’s eventual appearance will be more momentous for the delay. The closest parallel is in Euripides’ *Alcestis*, where a serving-girl emerges after the chorus’s first song and explains the situation (136–212), before Alcestis herself comes on stage. Contrast other plays where a dominant character like Ajax appears immediately after the parodos (cf. Creon in *Antigone*, Clytemnestra in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*, Medea in Euripides’ *Medea*, Taplin (1977) 283–4).

The exchange between the chorus and Tecmessa begins in recited anapaests, chanted to an accompaniment from the αὐλός, which ensure variety between the lyric sections 172–200 and 221/2–232. Stanford (on 208–9) argues that the anapaests are sung, on the basis of Doric forms strongly attested in 208, 234, and 257 (add 202); Gardiner (1987) 58–9 n. 19 prefers a ‘mixed delivery’ for the same reason. These are outnumbered, however, by non-Doric forms. Moreover, Doric alpha is only one of several characteristics typical of lyric anapaests (West (1982) 121), yet none of the others is found here. It is

more probable that Doric forms have been wrongly introduced in these four places, an error which commonly occurs (cf. Diggle (1991) 122), and which the alternation between song and recitation would have facilitated, than that S. chose to write sung anapaests which had, as their only distinctively lyric characteristic, the single feature which could be readily imported by careless scribes.

The chorus's shift from recitation to song at 221/2 is prompted by Tecmessa's confirmation that Ajax did kill the animals, and signals an increase in emotional tension (cf. M. Heath (1987) 177). Her news that some animals lie dead inside Ajax's hut goes beyond the grim rumour voiced in the parodos. (Compare the exchange between Cassandra and the chorus at Aesch. *Ag.* 1072–1177, where the prophetess's increasingly frantic cries move the chorus from speech, to a mixture of song and speech (from 1119), to song (from 1140).) From now on, Tecmessa chants, and the chorus sings. In general, she informs, and they react to that information; she describes what happened, and they imagine the consequences. The difference between speech and song accompanies and illustrates this distinction in function. (Burton (1980) 17 compares Aesch. *Pers.* 249–89, where the Messenger announces the destruction of the Persian army, provoking the chorus to sung lamentation. For epirrhematic exchange in general in S. see Mazzoldi (2003).)

The flow of information is not all one way (cf. Σ p. 68 Chr.): Tecmessa learns from the chorus that the animals came from the Greek herds, a significant revelation (233–4n.). None of this is new to the audience, whose attention is gripped not by the facts themselves but by the characters' agonised reactions to them. Athena had described the animal slaughter with joyous malevolence, and Ajax with misplaced triumph, Tecmessa's thorough account is characterised by intense sorrow. Amid all the concern for what Ajax did and what consequences will follow, the question of why he acted in this way fades into the background, not to be answered until Ajax himself appears. Similarly, the most shocking revelation of all – that Ajax attempted to kill the Greeks – remains unknown to his supporters.

201 Tecmessa enters from the skene, with attendants (344n.).

ναὸς ἄρωγοι τῆς Αἴαντος 'You who serve the ship of Ajax'. Ajax addresses the chorus in similar terms at 356/7, where also ἄρωγός is accompanied by an objective genitive (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 486 ἄρωγὰ τῆς δίκης ὀρκώματα, 'oaths which assist justice'). Tecmessa will appeal directly for help from the chorus at the conclusion of her narrative (329 ἀρήξαι).

202 γεγενᾶς χθονίων ἄπ' Ἐρεχθεϊδῶν 'members of the race descended from the earth-born Erechtheids'. According to the earliest account, Hom. *Il.* 2.547–51 (possibly a sixth-century Athenian interpolation: see West (1999a) 185, (2001a) 179–81), Erechtheus was a king of Athens, born from the earth and

fostered by Athena, to whom the Athenians offered sacrifices (see further R. Parker (1987) 193–204). Athenians could be called Ἐρεχθίδαι (Eur. *Med.* 824) even though most were not descended from Erechtheus. The same principle holds for the designations Θησείδαι (*OC* 1066), Θησεώς τόκοι (Aesch. *Eum.* 402), παῖδες Κραναιοῦ (*ibid.* 1011), and (for the Trojans) Πριαμίδαι (*Ag.* 537, *Cho.* 935); cf. Macleod (1973) 268 n. 5 ≈ (1982) 125 n. 6 = (1983) 21 n. 6.

The chorus are Salaminians, not Athenians; but Athens asserted a particularly close relationship with Salamis. By abolishing this distinction, Tecmessa's address constitutes one of the 'oblique references to Athenian interests or claims' occasionally found in tragedy (R. Parker (2005) 143 n. 29; cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 12–14, 397–402). Ajax will himself refer to the Athenians as τὸ σύντροπον γένος (861), reflecting a Salaminian perspective, although his status as an Aeacid remains unaffected (644–5n.; cf. Scodel (2006) 71).

γενεά (Reiske (1753) 2), a nominative in apposition to ἄρωγοί, could be right. χθόνιος 'earth-born' (cf. Eur. *Ba.* 538–41 ἀναφαίνει χθόνιον | γένος . . . | . . . Πενθεύς, δν Ἐχίων | ἐφύτευσε χθόνιος) has the additional nuance 'autochthonous' (cf. Tr. Adesp. fr. 274 *TrGF* χθονίους Ἰναχίδας, defined by Hesych. χ 444 = p. 216 H/C as αὐτόχθονας καὶ οὐκ ἐπήλυδας, and R. Parker (1987) 194–5). Mitchell (2007) 85–7 explores the ideological implications of Greek autochthony; according to Shapiro (1998) 132–3, its prevalence in Athens may go back to at least the sixth century. For the vocalism of Ἐρεχθεϊδῶν see 201–62n.

203–4 ἔχομεν στοναχὰς οἱ κηδόμενοι | τοῦ Τελαμώνος τηλόθεν οἴκου. 'we who care for the house of Telamon far away have cause for groaning.' For similar expressions with ἔχω in S. cf. 319–20, Lloyd-Jones (1992) 55 = (2005) 106; also the related idiom illustrated at 562–4n. Word order connects τηλόθεν with τοῦ . . . οἴκου, with –θεν denoting place where (Bruhn §28); but the choice of suffix is probably influenced by the idea that the care comes from people far away.

205–7 νῦν γὰρ ὁ δεινὸς μέγας ὠμοκρατῆς | Αἴας θολερῶ | κέϊται χειμῶνι νοσήσας. 'For now the dread, mighty, ferocious Ajax lies low, stricken by a turbid storm.' The cumulative force of three adjectives in asyndeton, the longest and most impressive last, makes for a pathetic contrast with the stark κέϊται. Ajax is often associated with the adjectives μέγας (cf. 1077, Hom. *Il.* 9.169, 11.563, 16.358, 23.811, Ibycus fr. S151.34 *PMGF*) and ὠμός (cf. 548, 885/6, 931). For the cause of sickness expressed by a dative cf. *Tr.* 544, Dawe (1964) 146–7. For χειμῶν of pain cf. *Phil.* 1460, Pearson on fr. 314.267, Hesych. χ 271 (p. 207 H/C) χειμῶν· ἡ ὥρα. καὶ κίνδυνος. παραχῇ. ζάλη. διωγμός. In general, "waves" and "storms" of madness or misery are conventional enough in Greek poetry' (Griffith on [Aesch.] *PV* 885–6; cf. 350–3, Eur. *Her.* 1091–2 ἐν κλύδωνι καὶ φρενῶν ταραγμάτι | πέπτωκα δεινῶ, *Or.* 279, Dem. 19.314

τῶν . . . κλύδωνα καὶ μανίαν τὰ καθεστηκότα πράγμαθ' ἡγουμένων, Harries (1891) 33–5, Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 1140, Mattes (1970) 112–13, Schnyder (1995) 152–4). Contrast ‘calm’ imagery describing psychological states (see Bond on Eur. *Her.* 1049). For κείται cf. *Τι.* 985–6 κείμαι πεπτονημένος ἀλλήλοισι | ὀδύνας with Davies.

Most manuscripts read ὁ μέγας, with an extra, unmetrical article encouraged by the preceding ὁ δεινός. A minority of manuscripts omit it, either through preservation of ancient tradition, deliberate emendation, or a lucky slip. The same error is found in most manuscripts at 914, where also O has the truth, and 956. Bentley deleted the article before this testimony was known (*teste* Porson (pre-1808b) 198: ‘R.B.’).

208–9 τί δ' ἐνήλλακται τῆς ἡμέριος | νύξ <∞ ∞ ∞ ∞ > ἦδε βάρος; ‘What fresh woe has this night received in exchange for the anxiety of the day?’ The lacuna is owed to Bruhn (*teste* W. Morel *ap.* Lloyd-Jones (1969) 29). My rendering translates an *exempli gratia* supplement δυσφροσύνης νέον; Bruhn suggests δυσφροσύνης πλέον (‘What woe, full of the anxiety . . .’), but the genitive is better construed with the verb: the day’s suffering, caused by the Judgment of the Arms, is now apparently exchanged for a new trouble arising during the night. If the paradosis is sound, we must supply two nouns with τῆς ἡμέριος, giving τί βάρος ἐνήλλακται ἦδε νύξ <τοῦ βάρους> τῆς ἡμέριος <μοίρας>; (‘What woe has this night taken in exchange for the woe of the day?’) Either way, the text is lacunose: and it is more probable that the lacuna is the result of scribal inaccuracy than of S.’s obscure writing. Feminine adjectives without a noun can denote periods of time, as at Hdt. 1.189.4 τὴν θερεῖην, 1.202.1 τὴν χειμερινήν; cf. also 1040 μὴ τεῖνε μακράν, Aesch. *Ag.* 916 μακράν γὰρ ἐξέτεινας with Fraenkel, Moorhouse 13–14, Collard (2005a) 372, and Lobeck’s n. But as JD points out, these are all in the accusative, which makes them quasi-adverbial. Ellipsis with the genitive ἡμέριος is harder to understand.

Thiersch (1826) 503 n. * suggests ἡρεμίας, which Dawe, *STS* 1 134 refutes. Dawe (p. 135) suggests that ἡμέριος means ‘ephemeral’, and that for the sense ‘belonging to the day’ we rather need ἡμερινός. But at Xen. *Oec.* 21.3 ἡμέριος is found in the latter sense; this is usually emended (with Stephanus) to ἡμερινός, but the parallel with our passage suggests that the text can stand. Here, for once, Xenophon’s tendency to avoid pure Attic (see Ll-J/W, *ST* on *Aj.* 378) is an advantage: he may well have used a poetic form.

Only H has the e-vocalism ἡμερίος (*coni.* Jebb; see 201–62n.). The other tragic occurrences show a-vocalism in lyric (398/9, *Ant.* 789, Eur. *Phoen.* 130, 1512, *IA* 1331) and e-vocalism in non-lyric anapaests (Eur. *Ion.* 87); as these are non-lyric anapaests, the latter should be preferred. For the aspiration see West’s Teubner Aeschylus, p. xxx. The weakly-attested variants ἀημερίος and ἀειμερίος are not attested elsewhere and do not fit the metre. Perhaps an alpha,

written as a Doricising gloss above the eta, intruded into the text (28n.), and the resulting ἀη– was subsequently ‘corrected’ to ἀει–.

210 παῖ τοῦ Φρυγίου Τελλεύταντος ‘Child of Phrygian Teleutas’. The chorus’s detailed, respectful address here and in the next lines establishes the woman’s identity and her relationship to Ajax. Tecmessa is not named until 331, and presumably many of the audience would not have known her name until then; even if she appeared in an earlier account of the story, it might not have been well-known. The name Tel(l)eutas is attested elsewhere only at ΣLB Hom. *Il.* 1.138 (*teste* Degen (1900) 32; not in Erbse). The Geneva scholia on Hom. *Il.* 1.138 (II 22.28 Nicole) call Tecmessa’s father Teuthras (so also Dictys Cretensis 2.18), which elsewhere (e.g. Hecataeus fr. 29a *EGM*) is the name of the king of Mysia who receives Auge and her son Telephus. Φρύγιος (cf. 488) is here specifically ‘Phrygian’, not ‘Trojan’ (1052–4n.): Tecmessa’s homeland has been destroyed (515), but Troy has not. Where S. located Telleutas’ Phrygia is unknown, if indeed he had a clear picture.

The minority reading Τελλεύταντος was conjectured by Bentley (pre-1742) 245 (*prob.* Maas (1960) = (1973) 229); most manuscripts have the unmetrical Τελεύταντος. At 331, the only other occurrence of the name in literature, Τελεύταντος is metrically guaranteed (there too Τελλ– is weakly attested). But that passage is from iambics, which in the case of at least one other name treat double consonants differently from anapaests (Ὀδυσ(σ)εύς: 148–9n.). Although Τελλεύταντος is probably right, this form in a few manuscripts may be a good conjecture rather than independent evidence: ‘doubling a consonant is a common expedient of medieval scribes when they think a short syllable needs to be made into a long one’ (West on Hes. *Op.* 410).

Two other possibilities are less attractive. (i) Porson¹ on Eur. *Hec.* 123 conjectures σὺ Τελεύ–, but the position of σὺ is undesirable. (ii) Jaeger (1811) 35–6 suggests Φρυγίοιο, but while the genitive in –οιο is well attested for Aeschylus and Euripides (cf. Sideras (1971) 115), the only supposed evidence for it in S., Pearson’s fr. 142 col. ii 1, is now known to be Euripidean (fr. 727c.25 *TrGF*).

211–13 λέγ’, ἐπεὶ σε λέχος δουριάλῳτον | στέρξασαν ἔχει θούριος Αἴας | ὥστ’ οὐκ ἂν αἰδρις ὑπέιποις. ‘Speak, since furious Ajax possesses you, as you acquiesce in a marriage won by the spear. So your suggestion would not be based on ignorance.’ For Tecmessa as a spear-won bride cf. 894–5; also 1013 on Teucer’s mother. δουρι– is a metrically essential reinterpretation by Livineius ‘V’ (31–3n.) of δορι– (cf. 894), itself corrupted to δορυ– in some manuscripts; sense requires instrumental –ι (cf. FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 743, West’s Teubner Aeschylus, p. xlvj).

Sophocles’ original ΣΤΕΡΞΑΣΑΝΕΧΕΙ can be divided στέρξασαν ἔχει as above (cf. 490–1 ἐπεὶ | τὸ σὺν λέχος ξυνῆλθον, εὖ φρονῶ τὰ σά), or as στέρξας ἀνέχει ‘loves and protects you’ (thus most editors). I prefer the former as

providing a more realistic, less romantic picture of the relationship between Tecmessa and Ajax, but the decision is finely balanced (Finglass (2009c) 85–9). θούριος is predicated of Ajax at 1213, again by the chorus, and of Ares (612/13–616/17n.). ὑπέποις is ‘hint’, ‘suggest’, not ‘answer’: Ajax’s condition defies straightforward explanation.

214 πῶς δῆτα λέγω λόγον ἄρρητον; ‘How indeed am I to tell an unspeakable story?’ Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.3 *infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem*. For δῆτα in questions see 42n.

215 θανάτῳ γὰρ ἴσον πάθος ἐκπεύσῃ. ‘You will learn of suffering equal to death.’ The conventional idea ‘equal to death’ (cf. fr. 359 *TrGF* ἰσοθάναντον, where see Pearson) has a proleptic irony: Tecmessa will strive in the next scene to prevent Ajax intensifying the disaster by killing himself. The minority variant βάρος for πάθος is probably an intrusive gloss (28n.; see Dawe, *STS* 1 136), perhaps influenced by βάρος in 209.

216–17 μανίᾳ γὰρ ἄλοῦς ἦμιν ὁ κλεινὸς | νύκτερος Αἴας ἀπελωβήθη. ‘Captured by madness, our famous Ajax has come to grief during the night.’ μανίᾳ . . . ἄλοῦς is ‘far more evocative than μανικός, which does not occur in tragedy’ (Long (1968) 107; cf. μανίᾳ ξύναντος at 611, also lyric). For emotions and passions which seize or hold those who experience them cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.599 πυκινὸν δ’ ἄχος ἔλλαβ’ Ἀχαιοὺς, Padel (1992) 131 with n. 62. For the accentuation of ἦμιν (thus Hermann (1802) 727; ἡμίν A, Livineius ‘pV’ (31–3n.)) see *El.* 17n., adding Radt’s n. on fr. 730b.18 *TrGF* and FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 959.

218–20 τοιαῦτ’ ἂν ἴδοις σκηνῆς ἔνδον | χειροδάκτυλα σφάγι’ αἰμοβαφεῖ, | κείνου χρηστήρια τάνδρός. ‘Such are the victims which you could see within the hut, rent by his hands, bathed in blood – the sacrifices of this man.’ Ritual terminology emphasises the horror; the ordered killing of sacrifice is a world away from Ajax’s savage frenzy (cf. 237–9n., 657–9n., 815–18n.). The location of the killings (emphasised by σκηνῆς ἔνδον) marks a further transgression of sacrificial norms (cf. Henrichs (2000) 181). For the perversion of sacrificial language in tragedy more generally see Burkert (1966) 116–21 = (2001) 17–21.

Compounds in –δάκτυλος in classical Greek are limited to tragedy (lyrics and anapaests only: Aesch. *Pers.* 105, *Sept.* 735, *Cho.* 860, 1071, fr. 132.1 *TrGF* = Ar. *Ran.* 1264, Eur. *Her.* 391, Tr. Adesp. fr. 720h, 720k) and lyric (Pind. fr. 140a.56 S–M, Bacchyl. 9.6, probably 25.11). For compounds in –βαφεῖς see Mülke (2007) 24 on S. P.Oxy. 4807 col. ii.7 φοινεικοβαφεῖς, who cites examples from tragedy and later prose.

χρηστήριον (<χράω) can mean ‘seat of an oracle’, ‘response given by an oracle’, or ‘sacrifice made at an oracle’; the last sense develops to simply ‘sacrifice’, as at Aesch. *Suppl.* 450 and *Sept.* 230–1 σφέγια καὶ χρηστήρια |

θεοῖσιν ἔρδειν. Here the Jena scholia identify an oracular sense by taking the word as a reference to present or past revelation (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Αἵαντος γεγεννημένα ἐδήλουν τὴν μανίαν αὐτοῦ, cited by Ellendt 789, *prob.* Wilamowitz (1931–2) II 45–6 n. 4 ‘ominös für die Zukunft’). But the proximity of σφάγια (as in *Septem*) tells against it. The σφαγ– stem recurs at 235 and 815, each time containing the idea of a perverted sacrifice (cf. L. Parker on Eur. *Alc.* 229).

The final, catalectic metron ————∪|—— (‘paroemiac’) overlaps the regular caesura by more than one short syllable, a licence found 20 times in tragedy out of 348 recitative paroemiacs (figures from L. Parker (1958) 82): cf. *Tr.* 972/3, 982 (three syllables), 1263, *Ant.* 161.

STROPHIC PAIR (221/2–232 ~ 245/6–256)

(1)	221/2	245/6		$ia_{\wedge} ia\ ia$
(2)	222/3	246/7		$cho\ ia\ ia_{\wedge}$
(3)	224/5	248/9		D^3
(4)	226	250		$cho\ cho -$
(5)	227/8	251/2		$ia\ 2cho\ ia_{\wedge}$
(6)	229/30	253/4		hi^c
(7)	231/2	255/6		see analysis
(8)	232	256		$ia\ ia_{\wedge}$

At (1) a popular alternative arrangement, οἶαν ἐξήλωσας || ἀνέρος ~ ὥρα τιν' ἦξει τοι || κρᾶτα, also gives acceptable metre: the colon — — υ — — — (as in 194b and 199) followed by an extended hemiepes, balancing the double-short rhythms later in the stanza. But it is textually less preferable (221/2–222/3n.).

At (4) pendant close indicates period-end; this corresponds in both stanzas to a major sense break. The colon recurs at Ar. *Thesm.* 109; S. *Ant.* 139–40 ~ 153–4 might provide a further parallel if divided — ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — — || — ∪ ∪ — — (thus Dale (1936) 197 with n. 1 = (1969) 16 with n. 3).

(5–6) is an example of S.'s fondness for 'passages where asclepiadic and iambo-choriambic verses are juxtaposed in a way which throws their compatibility into relief' (L. Parker (1997) 80). The opening iambic metron in (5) as it were stands for aeolic base, which we then find introducing the next, similar colon (cf. 1185 ~ 1192, 1199 ~ 1211, Parker (1997) 71, 79); both cola then end with the phrase $\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim$, for which Stinton (1975a) 103 = (1990) 140 compares [Aesch.] *PV* 134 ~ 142 and Eur. *Ba.* 385 ~ 401.

For the unnamed, probably aeolo-choriambic colon in (7) cf. Eur. *El.* 439 ~ 449, Ar. *Nub.* 703 ~ 807, L. Parker (1997) 199–200, Willink (2002) 55 = (2010) 388–9. The repeated double short distinguishes it from glyconic (cf. Itsumi (1984) 77). Stinton (1975a) 103–4 = (1990) 140–1 very tentatively suggests an alternative colometry (dividing after προσέρπον, θανείται, and κελαινοῖς), but as he admits, this introduces still further anomalies.

221/2–222/3 οἶαν ἐδήλωσας ἀνδρὸς αἰθωνος | ἀγγελίαν ἄτλατον
οὐδὲ φευκτάν ‘What tidings of the ardent warrior have you revealed,
unbearable, inescapable.’ For the opening period the paradosis in
the strophe gives —υ—υ—υ—υ—, in the antistrophe (245/6)
—υ—υ—(—)—υ—υ—. Two analyses restore responsion, of which I adopt
the former: (i) Keep the strophe unchanged; in the antistrophe, omit τοι (with
several manuscripts, including K) and emend κρᾶτα to κάρα (*coni.* Triclinius
p. 7.17–18 Tessier and in his text). (ii) In the strophe, emend ἀνδρὸς to ἀνέρος
(*coni.* Hermann², on his 241; Sideras (1971) 100, as corrected by FJ/W on
Aesch. *Suppl.* 426, gives examples of ἀνερ— in tragedy, which always appears
in lyric and with a long alpha), and read τοι and κρᾶτα in the antistrophe.
The sense of τοι in the antistrophe may help us decide between the options.
With that particle, ‘the speaker, as it were, buttonholes the listener’ (Lowe
(1973) 43); ‘its primary function is to bring home to the comprehension of the
person addressed a truth of which he is ignorant, or temporarily oblivious’
(Denniston 537). Such a force is unwanted in this lyric, since the chorus are
making a general exhortation (τιν’); nor is τοι found with any of the numerous
expressions involving ὦρα plus infinitive (cited 245/6–246/7n.; contrast Ar.
Thesm. 1228 ὦρα δὴ ὅτι βαδίζειν, where δὴ probably conveys immediacy).

For αἰθων of persons cf. 1088 (Menelaus of Ajax), *Sept.* 448 αἰθων τέτακται
λῆμα, Πολυφόντου βία, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 122 αἰθων γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ πεπύργωται
θράσει, Arnott’s commentary on Alexis, p. 56. The short vowel stem αἰθων—
is not attested elsewhere, and has been widely corrupted to the unmetrical
αἰθωνος. At Hesych. α 1873 (1 76 Schmidt) the lemma reads αἰθονα (which
he takes from a manuscript of Cyril’s *Lexicon*: see vol. iv p. xlvj), but αἰθωνα
according to Alberti 1 154 and Latte 1 68; even if Schmidt is right (which he
might be, since the word is listed among words beginning αἰθο—), the form
may well have come from our passage, and so would not be a parallel. At Hes.
Op. 363 read αἰθοπα with the manuscripts, not αἰθονα (*coni.* Bergk (1845) 209,
prob. McKay (1959)).

Lobeck^{2–3} argues that an adjective cannot have genitives in both —ωνος
and —ονος; note however νήφων, first found as νήφοσι in Theogn. 481 and
627 where later authors (e.g. Philostr. *Vit. App.* 2.36) have a long vowel.
In the variant αἰθοπος the short vowel is regular, but this adjective when
applied to a person always refers to skin colour, not temperament (cf. Eustath.
862.10 = III 250.21–3 Van der Valk; in the possible counter-example, Alexis
fr. 2.2 *PCG*, it probably means ‘Ethiopian’). The morphological licence is
more tolerable than the lexical. For corruption from αἰθων to αἰθοψ cf. Hes.
Op. 743.

For the genitive denoting the object of a report cf. 998, Bruhn §30.1, Barrett
on Eur. *Hipp.* 129–30. The variant φευκτόν is strongly attested, and gram-
matically possible in poetry (see Wackernagel (1926–8) II 49 = (2009) 460–1).

But this licence is overwhelmingly found where a distinctively feminine termination would have introduced hiatus, which would not apply here (thus Lobeck²⁻³). ἄτλατον earlier in the line could have been a source for the error; whereas if original *φευκτόν* had been changed to *φευκτάν*, it is hard to see why ἄτλατον remained apparently unscathed in the manuscript tradition. *φερτάν* in P may betray the influence of Eur. *Hec.* 157–8 *δουλείας τᾶς οὐ τλατᾶς*, | τᾶς οὐ φερτᾶς (so Dawe, *STS* 1 136, who notes the popularity of that play in the Byzantine period).

224/5–226 τῶν μεγάλων Δαναῶν ὑπο κληζομέναν, | τὰν ὁ μέγας μῦθος ἄξει. ‘spread by the mighty Danaans, which their mighty rumour fosters.’ The Danaans are μεγάλοι because they pose a threat to the chorus. Lloyd-Jones objects to the sense (‘great’) and conjectures μελέων, pointing to μέγας in the following line as a source of corruption (for confusion between *μεγ-* and *μελ-* cf. also *OR* 742, N. Wilson (2007) 81–2). But the regular sense (‘miserable’, ‘unhappy’) is inappropriate. Ll-J/W (*ST*) compare 620/1 μελέοις Ἀτρείδαις, but that passage is not to be argued from (n.).

ὑπο is only in Parisinus gr. 2820, while ὑπό (*coni.* Stephanus (1568) 11 from the scholia) is in K. The majority reading ὑποκληζομέναν gives a harsh construction to the genitive with no compensatory benefit. For manuscript errors involving incorrect word division see 177–8n. The present stem ἄξ- is found in epic and lyric, and occasionally tragic lyric (FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 856).

227/8–232 ὦμοι, φοβοῦμαι τὸ προσέρπον. περίφαντος ἀνὴρ | θανεῖται, παραπλήκτω χερί συγκατακτᾶς | κελαινοῖς ξίφεσιν βοτὰ καὶ | βοτῆρας ἵππωνώμας. ‘*Oïmoi*, I fear what is coming. The man will die exposed to the sight of all, since with the dark sword in his maddened hand he has slaughtered the beasts and the horse-guiding herdsmen.’ For the chorus’s fear cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 127 πᾶν μοι φοβερόν τὸ προσέρπον. The adjective περίφαντος applies to Ajax’s manifest guilt and the envisaged public execution. For the killing of the herdsmen see 25–7n.

ὦμοι should be preferred to ὡμοι as the older form (see Finglass (2009g) 206–12). οἶμοι, also weakly attested here, will be a corruption to the commoner word. At 340 I assume the reverse corruption, since ὦμοι is rare in iambics and nowhere else spoken by a woman; οἶμοι τάλαινα (or τάλας) occurs a score of times in tragedy, while ὦμοι τάλας appears only at *Phil.* 934 (v.l. οἶμοι). ἀνήρ for manuscript ἀνὴρ is owed to Hermann¹ (cf. 9–10n.).

For παραπλήκτω χερί cf. 40 δυσλόγιστον... χέρα. In tragedy πλήσσω etc. often denotes mental derangement (cf. fr. 248 *TrGF* ἀποπλήκτω ποδί, glossed by Hesych. α 6546 = 1 222 Latte as *μανιώδει*, Eur. *Her.* 935 γέλωτι παραπεπληγμένω, Collard (2006) 53), and so παραπλήκτω χερί more naturally goes with συγκατακτᾶς (referring to Ajax’s killing of the animals) than

θανεῖται (referring to Ajax's prospective execution). Hence we should (with Stephanus) punctuate before this phrase with a comma. For the combination of this dative with κελαινοῖς ξίφεσιν cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 623–4 (Hutchinson's text), Diggle (1990) 115 = (1994) 386. The vocalism –πληκτος is dominant in tragic lyric, with the sole exception of 596/7 (n.; cf. Björck (1950) 179–80, 236–7); we may thus reject the weakly-attested variant –άκτω (*coni.* Blaydes').

The epic aorist ἔκτα is paralleled at *Tr.* 38 and the other two tragedians (Sideras (1971) 106). Black is an unexpected colour for an iron weapon, and evokes a sinister atmosphere rather than the actual appearance (see Heiden (2008) 150 and Davies on *Tr.* 856). For the poetic plural for singular Lobeck compares Eur. *Ion* 192 χρυσέαις ἄρπαις, Pind. *P.* 4.242 Φρίξου μάχαιραι, and other passages.

βοτὸν in classical Greek is mainly found in lyric and tragedy, although it is attested for comedy (Ar. *Nub.* 1427, Cratinus fr. 181 *PCG*) and once in prose (Pl. *Men.* 237d). ἵππονώμας (*coni.* Porson (pre-1808a) 186) is metrically essential, and may be in L before correction; other manuscripts have –νόμας (for the corruption see Eur. *Hipp.* 1399, Ar. *Nub.* 571) and –νόμους ('horse-pasturers', attested at Ar. Byz. fr. 127 Slater; the corruption results from confusion with the more straightforward word, or, less likely, a minuscule error (α ~ ου; thus Alberti (1987) 189). Compounds from νωμάω are rare and poetic (Rüedi (1969) 84–6). 'The herdsmen were mounted, as well might happen where the herd was so extensive' (Campbell). The alternative, that horses were among the animals guarded by the herdsmen, does not fit the sense of νωμάω; moreover, in the many references to Ajax's victims there is no mention of horses (143–4 ἵππομανῆ λειμῶνα does not count).

233–4 ὦμοι· κέῖθεν κέῖθεν ἄρ' ἡμῖν | δεσμῶτιν ἄγων ἤλυθε ποίμνην· 'Oimoi. So it was from there, from there that he came to us, leading the flock in chains.' The chorus's revelation intensifies the horror: this was not some cattle-raiding expedition against a nearby settlement (cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.154 with Latacz *et al.* on 154–7, Langdon (2008) 256–8), but an attack by Ajax on his own camp. For ὦμοι see 227/8–232n. Repeated κέῖθεν marks Tecmessa's realisation; while for ἄρα used when 'the reality of a past event is presented as apprehended... at the moment of speaking' (Denniston 36) cf. 367, 908/9, 934, 1026, and the related use at 925/6–928/9n. ἄγω is idiomatic for the transport of captured prisoners and animals: cf. 296, Schreckenberg (1964) 16–18. ἤλυθον is found in high poetry from Homer on, and is frequent in Euripides (in spoken, recited, and sung verse), but is not elsewhere attested for S. (or Aeschylus). For the vocalism of ποίμνην (restored by Ellendt, 1835 ed., II 589) see 201–62n.

235–6 ὧν τὰ μὲν εἶσω ὄφαζ' ἐπὶ γαίᾳς, | τὰ δὲ πλευροκοπῶν δίχ' ἀνερρήγνυ. 'Of these, he cut the throats of some on the ground inside, while

he slashed the sides of others and tore them apart.’ Tecmessa describes the scene in greater detail at 298–300. For ὦν after a singular noun denoting a group cf. *OC* 1070, *Eur. Or.* 1134–5, Bruhn §16.11. Only Triclinius has τὰ (claimed in the Triclinian scholia, p. 7.2–3 Tessier, as his conjecture for the sake of the metre) . . . εἶσω; the majority reading is τήν . . . ἔσω (with minority variants τό and τόν), but τήν and ὦν can scarcely both refer back to ποίμνην. Metre proves Triclinius correct in 236, where he has τὰ (again, a metrical conjecture) against τὰς in the rest of the tradition. For εἶσω v.s. ἔσω here and at 296, 685 see Finglass (2009g) 212–15; ἔξω in **τ** will result from a polar error (cf. 420, 675, 1137, *El.* 382n.).

σφαζ’ (**τ**b, *coni.* Bentley (pre-1742) 245) for σφάζ’ yields an augment at trivial cost (24n.). The imperfect should be preferred over the aorist variant σφάξ’ to ensure balance with ἀνερρήγνυ; the same error occurs at 299.

πλευροκοπέω does not occur again until the Byzantine period. Its register is hard to judge: did the unusual compound have a poetic ring, or did its emphasis on the physical process of striking sound colloquial or prosaic?

237–9 δύο δ’ ἀργίποδας κριοὺς ἀνελών | τοῦ μὲν κεφαλὴν καὶ γλῶσσαν ἄκραν | ῥίπτει θερίσας ‘Taking two white-legged rams, from one he cut off the head and tongue by the roots and threw them away’. The rams probably represent Agamemnon and Odysseus. The special treatment which they receive encourages us to equate them with two of Ajax’s chief enemies, who in this play are Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Odysseus. The identification of the first animal is not immediately clear: cutting out the tongue would be an appropriate punishment both for Agamemnon, who would have pronounced the Judgment of the Arms (thus Hermann), and Odysseus, notoriously a persuasive speaker (thus Musgrave; cf. 150–1 etc.). But the second animal must be Odysseus, as Ajax’s words at 105–10 indicate; hence the first must be Agamemnon. The killing of Menelaus (cf. 97–100) is therefore not described.

Elements of this passage (together with 298–9) ‘may be interpreted as references to perverted sacrificial rites’ (Henrichs (2000) 181 n. 29; cf. 218–20n.). ἀναιρέω is found in a sacrificial context at *Hom. Od.* 3.453–4 οἱ μὲν ἔπειτ’ ἀνελόντες ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυσοδείης | ἔσχον· ἀτὰρ σφάξεν Πεισίστρατος. The tongue was regularly treated as a separate portion of an Athenian sacrifice (cf. *IG* I³ 255.B.7–9, from c. 430 BC, Dunbar on *Ar. Av.* 1702–5), a practice first attested at *Hom. Od.* 3.341 (although there the tongue is burned, whereas in Athens it was a perquisite of the officiating priest).

ἀργίπους is attested elsewhere at *Hom. Il.* 24.211, of dogs, where it probably refers to their speed (cf. 18.578, *Od.* 2.11 etc. κύνες πόδας ἀργοί). The stem ἀργι– means ‘white’ or ‘bright’, as at *Il.* 9.539 ἀργιόδους, 19.121, *Pind. O.* 8.3 ἀργικέρανος, *S. fr.* 534.2 *TrGF* ἀργινεφής. For the sense of γλῶσσαν ἄκραν, and the significance of elinguation, see Finglass (2009c) 224–8. For

the orthography of *ρίπτει* (thus Jb, *coni.* Elmsley, 1805/6 edn) see Finglass (2009g) 219–21. For *θερίζω* (properly ‘mow’) of severing body parts cf. fr. 659.4 *TrGF* (hair), Eur. *Suppl.* 717 (heads); the sense is commoner with *ἀποθερίζω* (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1188, *Or.* 128 (hair), Archil. fr. 222 *IEG* ἴνας δὲ μελέων . . . ἀπέθρισε, perhaps 89.12).

239–42 τὸν δ’ ὀρθὸν ἄνω | κίονι δῆσας | μέγαν ἵπποδέτην ῥυτῆρα λαβὼν | παῖει λιγυρᾷ μᾶστιγι διπλῇ ‘But the other he tied straight upright to a pillar, and, seizing a huge strap from a horse-harness, struck it with a shrill-sounding double whip.’ For the identification of the animal see the previous n. For this form of torture see 108n. For predicative ὀρθόν cf. 517, Moorhouse 167–8.

ῥυτῆρ (< ἔρω ‘draw, drag’) denotes any strap used to master a horse, including the reins; hence ἵπποδέτης, attested elsewhere only as the name of Heracles’ temple at Onchestus (Paus. 9.26.1, Hesych. 1 823 = 11 371 Latte [Alberti: –διτης cod.]; cf. ἵπποδέσμα, *hapax* at Eur. *Hipp.* 1225). The noun can also mean simply ‘whip’ (cf. fr. 501.2 *TrGF* ῥυτῆρι κρούων γλουτὸν ὑπτίου ποδός, though here Ajax is improvising his weapon (as perhaps at Dem. 19.197, Aeschin. 2.157 λαβὼν ῥυτῆρα μαστιγοῖην αἰχμάλωτον γυναικά). For λιγύς, λιγυρός of sound cf. Hom. *Il.* 11.531–2 ἵμασεν καλλίτριχας ἵππους | μᾶστιγι λιγυρῇ, Kaimio (1977) 231–3. μᾶστιξ is always ‘whip’ in tragedy (e.g. 1253–4; cf. Pearson on fr. 129.2 μᾶσθητα δίγονον), although in Homer it means ‘goad’; for its double lash cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 642 with Fraenkel.

243–4 κακὰ δεινάζων ῥήμαθ’, ἃ δαίμων | κοῦδεις ἀνδρῶν ἐδίδαξεν. ‘uttering terrible insults, which a god taught him, not a man.’ For action attributed to a δαίμων and denied to a human cf. *OR* 1258–9 λυσώντι δ’ αὐτῷ δαιμόνων δέικνυσσι τις | οὐδεις γὰρ ἀνδρῶν, οἱ παρῆμεν ἐγγύθεν. ‘It is a widespread belief among primitives that persons in abnormal mental states speak a special “divine” language’ (Dodds (1951) 85 n. 24, with references); gods and men are sometimes said in ancient literature to have different names for things (Güntert (1921), West on Hes. *Th.* 831 and (2007) 160–2, Watkins (1970) = (1994) 11 456–72).

δεινάζω ‘abuse’ is attested at *Ant.* 759, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 925, 951, Theogn. 1211, and Lyc. *Alex.* 404, while for ὁ δέννος cf. possibly Archil. fr. 148.2 *IEG* (*suppl.*), Hdt. 9.107.1, Lyc. *Alex.* 777, Herodas 7.104, Herzog (1894). For the partitive genitive denoting the second of two alternatives see *El.* 199n.

245/6–246/7 ὥρα τιν’ ἦδη κάρα καλύμμασι | κρυψάμενον ποδοῖν κλοπαῖν ἀρέσθαι ‘It is high time for a man to hide his head with a veil and steal away on foot.’ Covering the head indicates sorrow or shame (cf. Finglass (2009a) 276 n. 17); here these emotions are accompanied by fear of imminent death. κάλυμμα ‘veil’ (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1178, Eur. *IT* 372, Llewellyn-Jones (2003) 32–3) could denote a covering for the whole head except the eyes, as envisaged here

(cf. Eur. *IT* 372–3). No veiling occurs, *pace* Llewellyn-Jones (2003) 303 with 312 n. 113, (2005) 82 with 98 n. 59.

ὥρα followed by an infinitive ‘tends to be used when a situation has become desperate’ (Ll-J/W, *So.* on *Phil.* 1395, where they print ὥρα ὅτ’ ἐμοί (*coni.* Bergk (1849) v), citing *OR* 467 and Eur. *Held.* 288). For other examples (some involving urgency rather than desperation) see Kassel and Austin on Ar. fr. 480.1 *PCG*, Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 393–4, Collard (2005a) 370. The choice of the indefinite pronoun (403–4n.) rather than e.g. ἡμῖν broadens the impact of Ajax’s disgrace; Bergk’s ὅτιν does not persuade, not least because so many of the examples of ὥρα with infinitive omit a main verb.

Lloyd-Jones (1978) 217–18 advocates ὥρα ὅτιν ἄρμοι on the following grounds. At Ar. *Ach.* 393 most manuscripts read ὥρα ὅτιν ἤδη καρτερὰν ψυχὴν λαβεῖν, but the oldest and best, R, has ἄρά μοι instead of ἤδη; from this D. S. Robertson (*teste* Sommerstein *ad loc.*) and (independently) Lloyd-Jones (1958) = (1990b) 3 conjecture ἄρμοι (with ἤδη an intrusive gloss on the unfamiliar word: 28n.). Lloyd-Jones argues for a similar substitution here, pointing to τοι after ἤδη in many manuscripts. But if ἤδη displaced original ἄρμοι, it would be odd for the last part of the latter to acquire an initial tau and be reconstituted as an additional particle. Renehan (1992) 343 also questions the sense, noting that ἄρμοι tends to look backwards in time, not forwards (cf. e.g. [Aesch.] *PV* 615 ἄρμοι πέπαυμαι τοὺς ἐμοὺς θρηγῶν πόνους); on the word see further Persson (1921–2) 82–90.

For the choice of Triclinius’s κάρα over κῤῥα see 221/2–222/3n. For ποδοῖν κλοπὰν ἀρεσθαι cf. Eur. *Or.* 1499 δραπέταν . . . ἐξέκλεπτον ἐκ δόμων πόδα, fr. 759a.1600 *TrGF* σὺ δ’ ἐξέκλεψας πῶς πόδ’ ὥστε μὴ θανεῖν; For αἶρομαι cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 481 αἶρονται [Elmsley: αἰροῦν– vel αἰροῦν– codd.] φυγὴν, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 54 ἀρεῖσθαι [Nauck: αἰρεῖσ– Π: αἶρεσ– codd.] φυγὴν [Stephanus: φυγῇ(t) codd.], W. Barrett (2007) 258 n. 69.

248/9–250 ἡ θοὸν εἰρεσίας ζυγὸν ἐζόμενον | ποντοπόρῳ ναὶ μεθῆναι. ‘or to take his seat on the swift rowing-bench and give her way to a sea-going ship.’ ἔζομαι with a bare accusative is poetic (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 182–3 δαιμόνων δέ που χάρις, | βιαίως σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένων (with Booth (1976) on the text), K–G 1 313–14, Bers (1984) 69). The rowing, not the bench, is θοός; for enallage in S. see 7–8n. We must understand e.g. ἡνίας with μεθῆναι (giving an expression like Virg. *Aen.* 6.1 *classi* . . . *immittit habenas*): see Lobeck (ed. 2 pp. 190–1 = ed. 3 pp. 158–9). For ζυγόν of a rowing-bench see LSJ⁹ s.v. III 1, Morrison and Williams (1968) 51, Casson (1971) 220.

251/2–253/4 τοίας ἐρέσσουσιν ἀπειλὰς δικρατεῖς Ἀτρεΐδαι | καθ’ ἡμῶν ‘Such are the threats that the two kings, the Atridae, ply against us.’ The threats have not yet been issued, but the present tense makes them seem more immediate. Poetic τοῖος is much less common in tragedy than τοιόσδε and

τοιούτος, and may have had an epic nuance, since the reverse pattern applies in that genre (see L. Parker on Eur. *Alc.* 65). S. has three transmitted instances in verse (here, 928/9, *Ant.* 124), one in anapaests (*OR* 1306), and one in iambics (562), plus one restored by a plausible conjecture in iambics (fr. 474.1 *TrGF*); Aeschylus and Euripides use the word in song and speech.

For metaphorical ἐρέσσω ‘row’ cf. *Ant.* 158 μῆτιν ἐρέσσων, Dion. Chal. fr. 4.3 *IEG* εἰρεσίη γλώσσης, Van Nes (1963) 116, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 541. ἐρείουσιν ‘will thrust’ (*coni.* Wieseler (1861) 561; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 627, *Nub.* 1375 ἔπος πρὸς ἔπος ἡρειδόμεσθα, *Ran.* 914) removes the nautical metaphor (prepared for in the previous lines) and exchanges a present (cf. 245/6 ὦρα . . . ἤδη) for a future.

δικρατής (attested elsewhere only at *Ant.* 146 δικρατεῖς λόγχα) ‘is equiv<alent> to two distinct epithets (δύο and κρατούσαι)’ (Jebb, on that passage). In *Antigone* it denotes ‘two spears, each of which was victorious over the wielder of the other’; here δικρατεῖς Ἀτρεΐδαι means ‘two Atreidae, each of whom is a king’ (Jebb, *ibid.*). No corresponding stem μονοκρατ– is attested before Byzantine Greek. Contrast 389–90 δισσάρχας and *OC* 1055–6 τὰς διστόλους | ἄδμητας ἀδελφάς (‘the two journeying virgin sisters’), where adjectives in δι– unique to S. may have been coined on the basis of μονο– counterparts (μόναρχος Theogn. 52, Solon fr. 9.3 *IEG*; μονόστολος Eur. *Alc.* 407, *Phoen.* 742); the force of the μονο– stem is different, however (‘ruling alone’; ‘sent out on a solitary mission’: see Parker on the former).

253/4–256 πεφόβημαι λιθόλευστον Ἄρη | ξυναλγέιν μετὰ τοῦδε τυπείς, | τὸν αἶσ’ ἄπλατος ἰσχει. ‘I fear to share the agony of an onslaught of stones, struck at the side of this man, who is gripped by a monstrous fate.’ ‘Stoning is . . . a form of spontaneous collective punishment of an individual perceived to have wronged the community as a whole’ (Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 234–6; to his references add Rosivach (1987, especially pp. 242–5 on drama). The chorus’s fear nearly becomes reality for Teucer (727–8); for another military lynching cf. Eur. *IA* 1349–50. For λιθόλευστον Ἄρη cf. *Ant.* 36 φόνον . . . δημόλευστον and (for verbal elaboration of tragic stonings more generally) Aesch. *Sept.* 199 λευστήρα δήμου . . . μόρον, *Ag.* 1616 δημορριφεῖς . . . λευσίμους ἄρας.

For the perfect πεφόβημαι see 137–40n. For corruption of Ἄρη to Ἄρην cf. 1195/6, Elmsley (1812) 453, Wecklein (1869) 24. For ἄπλατος cf. *El.* 219–20n., adding Tr. Adesp. fr. 617.4 *TrGF* ἄπλατος ὁρμη, 653.14 ἄπλατος γίγας, West on Hes. *Th.* 153; for the corruption to ἄπλαστος see Pearson on fr. 387, West on Hes. *Th.* 150–2.

257–8 οὐκέτι λαμπρᾶς γὰρ ὑπὸ στεροπῆς | ἄξας δξὺς νότος ὥς λήγει. ‘No longer. Like the south wind, after it rises swiftly with bright lightning, he grows calm.’ Ajax’s ὄμματα . . . ἀστράπτοντα in the *Iliu Persis* (fr. 2.8 *GEF*) show the association of lightning and madness. For a trouble which begins δξὺς but then

fades away cf. *Phil.* 807–8 ἡδε (νόσος) μοι | ὀξεῖα φοιτᾷ καὶ ταχεῖ' ἀπέρχεται. For ὑπό of attendant circumstances cf. 351/2, 382, *El.* 630n. For the vocalism of στεροπῆς (restored by Dindorf *teste* Jebb) see 201–62n.

Ajax's madness is likened to a stormy wind which nevertheless abates. Paehler (1892) 25–9 conjectures ὑπό for transmitted ἄτερ, rescuing an otherwise unintelligible sentence at minimal cost. The description of the wind is especially close to Ibycus fr. 286.8–10 *PMGF* ὑπὸ στεροπᾶς φλέγων | Θρηϊκίος Βορέας | αἰσίων κτλ. JD suggests two possible methods of corruption: (i) ΓΑΡΥΠΟΣΤΕΡ became ΓΑΡΑΤΕΡΣΤΕΡ by anticipation of ΤΕΡ; (ii) ἄστερ–written above στεροπᾶς (cf. the minority reading, discussed below) entered the text, displaced ὑπό, and was 'corrected' to ἄτερ. Jebb (p. 224) lists other emendations, none plausible. The minority variant ἄστεροπᾶς (also 'lightning': cf. Sol. fr. 9.2 *IEG*, Ar. *Av.* 1746, 1748, Pind. *N.* 9.19) gives a word unattested elsewhere in tragedy; the same corruption has occurred in a few manuscripts at Hom. *Il.* [10.154], 11.66, 11.184, and 19.363. ἄξας for the unmetrical αἴξας of the manuscripts is owed to Livineius 'p' (31–3n.). λήγει should be followed with a full stop, not a comma, since καὶ νῦν in 259 begins a fresh point.

Transmitted λαμπρᾶς . . . ἄτερ στεροπᾶς would have to go with either ἄξας or λήγει. The former gives the sense 'he grows calm, like the south wind which has rushed sharply but unattended by lightning' (Triclinius). But 'the fury of Ajax, so fierce while it lasted, would not be happily compared to a storm *not* accompanied by lightning' (Jebb, p. 223). Editors cite Theophr. *De Signis* 32 (p. 78 Sider and Brunschön) θέρους ὅταν ἀστραπαὶ καὶ βρονταὶ γίνωνται ἐντεύθεν πνεύματα γίνεται ἰσχυρά· ἐὰν μὲν σφόδρα καὶ ἰσχυρὸν ἀστράπτῃ θάττον καὶ σφοδρότερον πνεύσουσιν, ἐὰν δ' ἥρεμα καὶ μακρῶς, κατ' ὀλίγον. τοῦ δὲ χειμῶνος καὶ φθινοπώρου τοῦναντίον· παύουσι γὰρ τὰ πνεύματα αἱ ἀστραπαὶ· καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν ἰσχυρότεραι γίνωνται ἀστραπαὶ καὶ βρονταὶ τοσούτω μᾶλλον παύονται. But meteorological theory, scarcely familiar to many in the audience, cannot overcome the objection framed in poetic terms.

With the latter there are three possibilities. (i) The phrase is proleptic, meaning ὥστε ἄτερ στεροπῆς εἶναι, 'ceases so as to be without the lightning flash' (Campbell). For parallels Campbell refers to the section on prolepsis in his *Essay on the Language of Sophocles* (in his edition, vol. 1 pp. 70–1), but the examples cited there are all of a single adjective (e.g. *OC* 1200 τῶν σὼν ἀδέρκτων ὁμμάτων τητῶμενος 'deprived of your eyes, so that they see no more'). In our passage we would have to take a whole phrase in this way, which is moreover at the front of its clause and widely separated from the verb with which it is supposed to be proleptically associated. It would be as if ἄτερ ὕδατος τὸ φρέαρ ἀπεξηράνθη could mean 'the well was dried up, so that it was without water'. (ii) Campbell's rejected alternative is "He desists without lightning:" i.e. his violence comes to an end without doing irreparable harm.' This relies

on an unparalleled sense for στεροπή. (iii) Jebb paraphrases “‘Attended by the lightning-flash no more, the storm in his soul is subsiding’, citing (after Paehler (1892) 26 n. 2) [Arist.] *Prob.* 942a34 ὁ νότος, ὅταν μὲν ἐλάττων ᾖ, αἰθριός ἐστιν, ὅταν δὲ μέγας, νεφώδης as evidence for the absence of a storm presaging the weakening of the wind (though there the reference is to cloud, not lightning or even a storm). But the Greek does not correspond to Jebb’s elegant expression: λαμπρᾶς . . . ἔτερ στεροπᾶς means simply ‘without bright lightning’, and to declare that a wind ‘is subsiding without bright lightning’ is as odd in Greek as it is in English. The sense ‘attended by’ desiderated by Jebb requires the emendation which I adopt, which has the further advantage of making the phrase positive, not negative, and thus connecting it with the neighbouring phrase ἄξας ὀξύς rather than the distant λῆγει.

259–62 καὶ νῦν φρόνιμος νέον ἄλγος ἔχει | τὸ γὰρ ἐσλεύσσειν οἰκεία πάθη, | μηδενὸς ἄλλου παραπράξαντος, | μεγάλας δδύνας ὑποτείνει. ‘And now, in his sanity, he has fresh pain. For to behold self-inflicted sufferings, when no one else has contributed to them, lays sharp pangs to the soul.’ φρόνιμος hints at an idea that Tecmessa will explain at greater length. For the sense of οἰκεία πάθη cf. [919], *El.* 215–16 οἰκείας εἰς ἅτας| ἐμπίπτεις οὕτως ἄκῳ;., *OC* 765–6 τοῖσιν οἰκείοις κακοῖς | νοσοῦνθ’.

For ἐσλεύσσω in this context cf. Zen. Ath. 2.104 ἐξάντης λεύσσω τοῦμὸν κακὸν ἄλλον ἔχοντα (compared by Bühler, vol. v pp. 585–6). Whether the word should be written λεύσσω or λεύσω (the latter is a minority variant here and at 546, 886/7, 890, 1044) was debated in antiquity: see Bühler, *ibid.* pp. 582–3, Thraette 1515, Morpurgo Davies (1987) 461 with n. 7.

παραπράσσω ‘contribute to doing’ has παρα– as in παραίτιος ‘partially responsible, along with someone else’ (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 910, fr. 44.7 *TrGF*, Fraenkel on *Ag.* 811). Elsewhere it means ‘go beyond one’s chief aim’ (Hdt. 5.45.1) or ‘act wrongly’ (Dio 53.23.5, 76.7.4; cf. Plut. *Agis* 16.1 ‘exact unjustly’).

ὑποτείνω literally means ‘stretch out beneath’; hence interpretations such as ‘graves subdit dolores’ (Brunck) and ‘lays to/beneath’ (Jebb, citing [Dem.] 13.19 τὰς ἐλπίδας ὑμῖν ὑποτείνων). My translation is taken from Jebb; his phrase ‘to the soul’ conveys the proverb ὑπο–, since both denote internal agony. LSJ⁹ s.v. 1 2 prefer ‘intensifies’ (cf. Campbell’s ‘causes intense grief within’), which they see as a metaphorical development from the sense ‘strain, pull hard’ at Ar. *Pax* 458; but that passage is itself exceptional (‘bend to it’ – Olson), and they cite no parallel for the sense alleged here. Olson (*ibid.*) cites our passage among examples meaning ‘hold forth, promise’ (e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 657 ὑποτείνων μισθοῦς), but that makes the consequential pain less immediate.

263–81 This exchange highlights the paradox that Ajax’s sanity may cause more trouble than his madness, a variant on the idea that mental disturbance or other ignorance abolishes suffering (cf. Eur. fr. 205 *TrGF* φρονῶ δ’ ἅ πάσχω,

καὶ τόδ' οὐ σμικρὸν κακόν· | τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι γὰρ ἡδονὴν ἔχει τινά | νοσοῦντι [Conti Bizzaro: –τα Stobaeus], κέρδος δ' ἐν κακοῖς ἀγνωσία, *Hipp.* 247–9, *Or.* 235–6, *Ba.* 1259–62, *Ter. Hec.* 286–7). It reveals that Tecmessa, a mere woman and slave, is the chorus's superior not only in knowledge (210–13), but also in understanding, as emphasised by the explicitly didactic question-and-answer format; it thus prepares for the wisdom of her later appeal to Ajax himself (485–524n.). In structural terms, it provides a bridge – and a breathing space – between two intensely emotional passages in which Tecmessa describes Ajax's actions over the past night (cf. M. Heath (1987) 177). The section has a thematic relevance, in that it emphasises the importance of social environment and community, especially at times of grief; the audience may question whether Ajax is as aware of their significance (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 24 with n. 42). And it looks forward to Ajax's account of his son's incapacity to perceive misfortune (552–9n.). The criticism of Fraenkel (1977) 9 – 'per un moderno è un discorso freddo, con tutta questa aritmetica' – is unmerited.

263 ἀλλ' εἰ πέπαυται, κάρτ' ἂν εὐτυχεῖν δοκῶ. 'Well, if he has recovered, I think that he may be well.' ἀλλά denotes 'a sympathetic reaction to the previous speaker's words or actions' (Denniston 19, citing e.g. *Ti.* 229). The subject of πέπαυται is Ajax (cf. 279), not the sickness. He is also the subject of εὐτυχεῖν; according to Jebb and Budelmann (2000) 51–2, the subject also includes Ajax's companions, but a change of subject from πέπαυται would have to be signalled.

264 φρούδου γὰρ ἤδη τοῦ κακοῦ μείων λόγος. 'For less account is taken of trouble already past.' The chorus take a simple view of Ajax's return to sanity, which will in fact involve a lengthy and painful process (305–26). For the thought cf. fr. 375 *TiGF* μόχθου γὰρ οὐδεὶς τοῦ παρελθόντος λόγος, Pind. *I.* 8.11–12 ἐμοὶ δεῖμα μὲν παροιχόμενον [Benedict, *prob.* W. Barrett (2007) 191–2 n. 211: –ομένων codd.] | καρτερὰν ἔπαυσε μέριμναν. For other verbless expressions where λόγος means 'concern' see Headlam on Herodas 3.43.

265–7 πότερα δ' ἂν, εἰ νέμοι τις αἶρεσιν, λάβοις, | φίλους ἀνιῶν αὐτὸς ἡδονὰς ἔχειν, | ἢ κοινὸς ἐν κοινοῖσι λυπεῖσθαι ξυνών; 'Which would you prefer, if someone gave you the choice – either to grieve your friends while enjoying pleasure yourself, or to be one among participants in mutual pain?' κοινὸς ἐν κοινοῖς 'emphasises the idea of mutual sympathy' (Jebb; for the polyptoton cf. 620/1 ἀφιλα παρ' ἀφίλοις), while ξυνών 'marks that while Ajax was delirious, he stood apart from the grief which others felt for him' (Campbell; contrast 273).

268 τό τοι διπλάζον, ὦ γύναι, μείζον κακόν. 'The twofold sorrow, lady, is the greater evil.' For τοι between article and noun see Denniston 548, Diggle (1996a) 16.

269 ἡμεῖς ἄρ' οὐ νοσοῦντος ἀτώμεσθα νῦν. 'Then we are suffering now, although he is not sick.' ἄρα marks logical connexion (Denniston 40–1). νοσοῦντος for transmitted νοσοῦντες is owed to Hermann¹. It is Ajax who is no longer sick, not Tecmessa and the chorus. The corruption, limited to a single letter, would be an easy mistake by someone who assumed the participle must agree with the neighbouring verb. For non-articular participles referring to a specific individual cf. 1067–8, Moorhouse 258–9, Diggle (1982) 61 = (1994) 226. ἀτάομαι is found elsewhere only at 384, *Ant.* 17, 314, and *Eur. Suppl.* 182; Haskins *ap.* Calder (1922) conjectures it at Aesch. *Ag.* 1656.

Defenders of the paradosis urge that Tecmessa identifies herself and the chorus with Ajax's suffering (e.g. Anonymous B (1811) 133). But this would be inept in a dialogue based on contrast and comparison between Ajax and his companions. Jebb cites *OR* 60–1 νοσεῖτε πάντες· καὶ νοσοῦντες, ὥς ἐγὼ | οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῶν ὅστις ἐξ ἴσου νοσεῖ, but the identification there is explicit; nor is that passage built around a series of oppositions. Jebb admires the rhetorical antithesis between νοσοῦντες and ἀτώμεσθα; but there is no less striking a paradox in claiming that the absence of sickness in Ajax should be accompanied by suffering on the part of his friends. Nor does the chorus's subsequent confusion support the transmitted text. With the emendation, Tecmessa's words make sense, but require unpacking; this follows in 271–7, where she expands the compressed antithesis between ἡμεῖς and οὐ νοσοῦντος into two more leisurely oppositions (αὐτὸς μὲν . . . ἡμᾶς δὲ . . . κείνός τε . . . ἡμεῖς θ'), where ἡμεῖς denotes Tecmessa and the chorus, not Ajax as well (cf. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 23–4 n. 41). Without the emendation, she speaks nonsense, and the chorus's incomprehension will reflect not her superior understanding (263–81n.), but verbal incompetence.

270 πῶς τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; οὐ κάτοιδ' ὅπως λέγεις. 'What was that you said? I do not know what you are saying.' ὅπερ (*coni.* Meineke (1863) 277) is possible, with preceding πῶς encouraging the corruption, but the repetition is not itself objectionable.

271–3 ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος, ἡνίκ' ἦν ἐν τῇ νόσῳ, | αὐτὸς μὲν ἡδεθ' οἷσιν εἶχετ' ἐν κακοῖς, | ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς φρονοῦντας ἡνία ξυνών· 'That man, when he was afflicted by his sickness, himself took pleasure in the troubles which gripped him, but caused grief through his presence to us who were sane.' For ἀνὴρ (Hermann¹) see 9–10n. For ἔχομαι cf. *Ti.* 1074 ἀστένακτος αἰὲν εἰχόμεν [Meineke: ἐσπόμην codd.] κακοῖς, *Hdt.* 1.35.1 ἀνὴρ συμφορῇ ἐχόμενος, 9.37.2 ὁ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κακῷ ἐχόμενος κτλ. For nouns incorporated into a relative clause cf. 1044, 1058, *El.* 653n. ξυνών is used here in a chiefly physical sense (contrast 267).

The minority variant βλέποντας (for φρονοῦντας) is weak ('we who were watching him'), and removes the antithesis between ἡνίκ' ἦν ἐν τῇ νόσῳ and

τοὺς φρονοῦντας. Dawe, *STS* 1 137 suggests *OR* 419 as a model for the variant, where, as he says, ‘the presence of ὁρθ’ makes all the difference’.

274–6 νῦν δ’ ὥς ἔληξε κἀνέπνευσε τῆς νόσου, | κείνός τε λύπη πᾶς ἐλήλαται
κακῇ | ἡμεῖς θ’ ὁμοίως οὐδὲν ἥσσαν ἢ πάρος. ‘But now that he has relief and
respite from his sickness, he is totally racked with painful grief, and we likewise,
no less than before.’ κἀνέπνευσε is predominantly metaphorical, but may also
suggest the irregular breathing which can characterise madness in tragedy
(cf. Eur. *Her.* 869, 1092–3, *Or.* 277, Vasquez (1972) 218). The minority variant
κάπτεπνυσε (for the active in a middle sense cf. Eur. fr. 118.3 *TrGF*) shows the
substitution of a commoner word of similar shape and meaning (56–8n.); it
is further corrupted to κατέπνυσε in G. For ἐλαύνομαι predicated of those
afflicted by suffering cf. *Tr.* 1044–5 συμφορὰς . . . | . . . οἷσις . . . ἐλαύνεται, Eur.
Alc. 675–6, *Andr.* 31, *Ion* 1619–20, Pl. *Phaedr.* 240c, Padel (1992) 118 n. 16. The
violent verb is especially forceful after the previous line had suggested that
suffering was now over.

277 ἄρ’ ἐστὶ ταῦτα δις τόσ’ ἐξ ἀπλῶν κακά; ‘Is this not a double in place
of a single sorrow?’ (Lloyd-Jones). ἄρα ‘ostensibly leaves the issue open to
the person addressed, and the appeal for confirmation is the more confident
because less obviously stressed’ (Denniston 46). τόσος (as opposed to τόσσος)
is found elsewhere in tragedy only in the phrase δις τόσα and at Aesch. *Pers.*
786. For ἐκ denoting a previous state cf. *Tr.* 618–19 χάρις . . . | . . . ἐξ ἀπλῆς
διπλῆ, Bruhn §68.iv.

278–80 ξύμφημι δὴ σοι καὶ δέδοικα μὴ ἔ θεοῦ | πληγὴ τις ἦκει. πῶς γάρ,
εἰ πεπαυμένος | μὴδὲν τι μᾶλλον ἢ νοσῶν εὐφραίνεται; ‘I agree with you,
and fear that a blow from God has come. How could it not, if after recovering
he is in no way happier than when he was sick?’ Tecmessa’s dire reason-
ing strengthens the chorus’s belief in divine intervention, founded earlier on
the ground that Ajax’s actions were out of character (183–5). Since after an
ordinary sickness one feels better, Ajax’s continued misery even after recovery
suggests something unusual, which the chorus put down to a god’s intervention
(Winnington-Ingram (1980) 25 n. 44).

δὴ emphasises the agreement (Denniston 227). For the θεοῦ πληγὴ see 137–
40n. For strengthening τις see Bond on Eur. *Her.* 347. ἦκει (ZrWa, *coni.* Elmsley
(1814) 355–6) should be preferred over the variant subjunctive –ῃ because the
fear is for a past action with an impact on the present situation (cf. Hom. *Od.*
5.300, Thuc. 3.53.2, Dem. 19.96, Eur. *IA* [1534–7], S. *El.* 581n.). The majority
reading –οι may have come from reminiscence of 186 (thus Garvie). Elsewhere
πῶς γάρ confirms a *negative* statement (Denniston 86; contrast 1010–11n. on
πῶς γάρ οὐ;).

281 ὥς ὧδ' ἐχόντων τῶνδ' ἐπίστασθαί σε χρή. 'Since this is the case, you must recognise it.' (Cf. Moorhouse 256: 'This is so, and your understanding must be on that basis.'). ὥς accompanies the genitive absolute without affecting the sense (cf. 904, 981); after a main verb of knowledge or perception, the ὥς clause as it were stands in the place of a regular subordinate clause, while remaining grammatically distinct from one (cf. Eur. *Med.* 1311 ὥς οὐκέτ' ὄντων σὼν τέκνων φρόντιζε δῆ, K–G II 93–4).

282 τίς γάρ ποτ' ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ προσέπτατο; 'How did evil first swoop upon him?' The ἀρχὴ κακοῦ, 'beginning of evil', is an epic idea (Hom. *Il.* 5.62–3 νῆας εἴσας | ἀρχεκάκους, 11.604 ἐκμολεν Ἴσος Ἀρηϊ· κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή) taken up by tragedy (cf. 934–5, *Tr.* 871–2 ὥς ἄρ' ἦμιν οὐ σμικρὼν κακῶν | ἦρξεν τὸ δῶρον Ἡρακλεῖ τὸ πόμπιμον, Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 229–31) and historiography (Hdt. 5.97.3 αὐται δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἑλληνί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι, Thuc. 2.12.3 ἥδε ἡ ἡμέρα τοῖς Ἑλλήσι μεγάλων κακῶν ἄρξει). Here it stresses the significance of Tecmessa's coming narrative, although that scarcely goes back to the beginning of Ajax's trouble (284–330n.). Together with the verb (literally 'How did the beginning of evil swoop . . .'), it marks a brief rise in the stylistic level, after the prosaic preceding section.

For examples of γάρ introducing a request for additional information (101–2n.) which is answered by a messenger speech see Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 1086; also Pind. *P.* 4.70 τίς γάρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας . . .; another ornate question which leads into a substantial narrative. προσπέτομαι metaphorically predicated of evil suggests a sudden onrush of trouble: cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 642–4 δδύρομαι | θεόσσυτον χειμῶνα καὶ διαφθοράν | μορφῆς, δθεν μοι σχετλιά προσέπτατο, Eur. *Alc.* 420–1 οὐκ ἄφνω κακὸν τόδε | προσέπτατ', Sansone (1975) 9. προσέπτατο, not προσέπετετο, is the usual tragic aorist (Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 865–6).

283 δῆλωσον ἡμῖν τοῖς ξυναλγοῦσιν τύχαις. 'Reveal to us, who share your pain, what happened.' The chorus ask for information because of their shared grief, and Tecmessa gives it on that ground (cf. 284). Linwood¹ conjectures τύχαις (δυστυχίαις P^{gl}, *teste* Blaydes¹), giving ' . . . who share your pain at what happened': cf. Moschion 97 F 9.9–10 *TrGF* κανθούς . . . ἐξέτηξε δακρύοις | τύχαις συναλγῶν, [Aesch.] *PV* 288 ταῖς σαῖς δὲ τύχαις, ἴσθι, συναλγῶ, Eur. *Alc.* 614 ἦκω κακοῖσι σοῖσι συγκάμνων, τέκνον. But for δῆλωσον . . . τύχαις cf. *OR* 680 μαθοῦσά γ' ἥτις ἡ τύχη.

284–330 Tecmessa's extended account, which shares some characteristics with tragic messenger speeches (284n., 285–7n. (*bis*), 295n.), covers material both familiar and unfamiliar to the audience. The new information comes at the beginning and end: Ajax's exchange with Tecmessa, so expressive of their characters and relationship (288–94n.); and his recovery from the bout

of madness, his reactions to it, and his present desperate state (305–26). In between, the audience hears of Ajax's arrival with the animals and their mutilation, events already described by Athena (61–5) and Tecmessa herself (233–44, in *anapaests*). Tecmessa emphasises the moment of Ajax's return (296–7), and describes the torture more briefly than before, without reference to individual beasts (298–300). Athena's account had been briefer still, because for her it was an appendage to the story of Ajax's maddened attack in the meadow; Tecmessa, by contrast, has no idea what happened while Ajax was out (295n.). As a result, the narrative, despite the near-total absence of evaluative terms (285–7n.), conveys the strangeness of the night's events as seen from Tecmessa's perspective: one moment Ajax is off on a mysterious mission, and the next back with a menagerie of animals which he proceeds to abuse. Her account of Ajax's conversation with Athena fits this implied incomprehension (301–4); for her, Athena is merely 'some shadow' which Ajax addresses in his derangement. (In the prologue the torture is still work in progress when Ajax speaks to Athena, whereas Tecmessa makes no mention of further attacks after his return from that conversation. As M. Heath (1987) 177 n. 22 points out, 'Sophocles has chosen the most effective arrangement at each point: it is more dramatic for Ajax to be in the middle of his cruel activity when he appears on stage, but that would make Tecmessa's narrative unnecessarily untidy'.)

Tecmessa's style is relatively plain. The simplicity of 298–300 contrasts with 55–8, where Athena describes a similar situation in language of remarkable syntactic density. The goddess revels verbally in her mastery of the once-mighty warrior; Tecmessa expresses as clearly as possible the events of the night to the questioning chorus. The frequency of connecting *καί* (288, 294, 295, 298, 305, 307, 311, 326; *El.* 897n.) and *ἐπειτα* (305, 312; *El.* 419n.) reinforces the plainness and adds to the immediacy. Her direct speech takes a step towards colloquialism, again befitting the context (288–9n., 289–91n.).

The narrative slows down during the description of Ajax's cries of realisation (317–22). For the first time, Tecmessa stops describing one event after the next, and instead draws a contrast between Ajax's present and past behaviour. Such a comparison would have been otiose before, so bizarre were his actions; at least this latest act can be framed as a transgression of a previously honoured principle. Still, her words emphasise that even though Ajax has apparently recovered from his madness, he may never return to his former state. In a low-key but ominous climax, Tecmessa 'introduce[s] the idea that Ajax poses a threat to himself' (M. Heath (1987) 177; 326n.). The external peril mentioned in the epirrhematic dialogue, namely stoning, is no longer to the fore. The prospect of lynching would blur or obliterate the tragic dilemma of the next part of the play; that is, whether or not Ajax should end his life.

The speech is dominated by the theme of verbal communication and its failure. Ajax sets out at night without being instructed (289–91); Tecmessa

expresses her doubts, only to be reminded of the virtues of silence (293). Ajax's return to the hut and torture of the animals defy explanation and do not receive one; his only words are directed at an apparently non-existent figure (301–4). Even when he returns to sanity, he takes refuge in inarticulate cries (308) and prolonged silence (311) before asking Tecmessa what happened. This exchange, far from offering comfort or consolation, is based around threats and terror (312–13, 315–16); Ajax then turns back to cries of lament, unprecedented on his lips (317–22), and further silence (325), this time foreboding trouble (326). Seen in this light, Tecmessa's concluding appeal to the power of the chorus's words (330) has an unconsciously ironic tinge. Does Ajax possess the capacity for the kind of conversation which she is envisaging?

284 ἅπαν μαθήσῃ τοῦργον, ὥς κοινωνὸς ὢν. 'You will learn all about the deed, since you have a share in it.' The chorus asked to hear the beginning of Ajax's trouble (282); Tecmessa goes further and promises that they will hear 'everything' (cf. 734, *El.* 378n.). κοινωνός acknowledges the chorus's ξυναλγοῦσιν. For messengers who begin by 'declaring their intention to narrate' see *El.* 680n., Finglass (2005a) 561.

285–7 κείνος γὰρ ἄκρος νυκτός, ἥνιχ' ἔσπεροι | λαμπτήρες οὐκέτ' ἦθον, ἄμφηκες λαβών | ἐμαίετ' ἔγχος ἐξόδους ἔρπειν κενάς. 'At the beginning of night, when the evening watch-fires were no longer burning, he seized his two-edged sword and made as though to go out on an empty mission.' Nightfall provides the backdrop for treachery, as at John 13.30 λαβών σὺν τῷ ψωμίον ἐκεῖνος ἐξῆλθεν εὐθύς· ἦν δὲ νύξ. For γάρ 'after an expression denoting the giving or receiving of information' (Denniston 59), especially in messenger speeches, cf. 749, *El.* 681n.

ἄκρος 'qualifying a period of time usually denotes, not the middle, but either the beginning or the end' (Gow on Theocr. 11.35 ff.; see further Pind. *P.* 11.10n.). The evening lamps are out: evening is over, night has begun. Cf. fr. 991c *TrGF* ἀκρόνυξ (with Radt (1968) = (2002) 40–1), which Phot. α 862 (1.92 Theodoridis) defines οἷον ἀρχὴ νυκτός. Σοφοκλῆς. The alternative 'at dead of night' fits neither the usual sense of ἄκρος nor the reference to the watch-fires. For the genitive of time see 21–2n.

ἄλαμπτήρ is not a mere synonym of λαμπάς, but rather an alternative to it with the double advantage of a more lofty sound, as a non-Attic word, and a meaning not limited to any specific light-giver' (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 22). For the burning of λαμπτήρες at evening cf. Hom. *Od.* 18.305–8 μένον δ' ἐπὶ ἔσπερον ἐλθεῖν. | τοῖσι δὲ τερπομένοισι μέλας ἐπὶ ἔσπερος ἦλθεν. | αὐτίκα λαμπτήρας τρεῖς ἴστασαν ἐν μεγάροισιν, | ὄφρα φαείνοιεν, *Tr. Adesp.* fr. 407 *TrGF* ἐφ' ἔσπερον δαίονσα λαμπτήρος σέλας. In the camp such fires are extinguished when evening turns into night, so that the army can sleep (cf. 291). Contrast Hom. *Il.* 8.508–11 and 9.88, where watch-fires at night signal

extraordinary circumstances in the Trojan and Greek camps respectively; contrast too the continued burning of lamps through the night at a party or celebration (e.g. Hom. *Od.* 19.63–4, with 66 διὰ νύκτα, Hor. *C.* 3.8.14–15 *vigiles lucernas* | *perfer in lucem*, Prop. 3.8.1). For the lighting and quenching of lamps used to denote time cf. Hdt. 7.215 περὶ λύχνων ἀφάς and Lobeck's n.

For intransitive αἶθω cf. Pind. *O.* 7.48 αἰθοίσας ἔχοντες σπέρμ' ἀνέβαν φλογὸς οὐ and perhaps Aesch. *Cho.* 536–7 πολλοὶ δ' ἀνῆθον [Valckenaer (cf. Σ ἀνέλαμψεν): ἀνῆθον cod.: ἀνῆθοντ' Meineke] ἐκτυφλωθέντες σκότῳ | λαμπτήρες, Ar. *Pax* 612 (see N. Wilson (2007) 107). Pearson's ῆθοντ' οὐκέτ' is thus unnecessary, and undesirable, since it involves two separate unmotivated changes. For comparable locutions with λαβών cf. 1115, Stinton (1975b) 84–5 = (1990) 101–2. For ἔγχος 'sword' see 95n. μαίωμα is found in epic, lyric, and tragedy, but not prose.

κενός reflects Tecmessa's knowledge after the event; at the time she did not know Ajax's purpose and could not have so designated it. *El.* 742 (n.) provides an exact parallel: the Paedagogus calls Orestes ὁ τλήμων, which only makes sense in terms of the subsequent catastrophe. In both plays, the rest of the speech is delivered from the perspective of the speaker at the time that the events were taking place ('experiencing focalisation', as usual in messenger speeches: *El.* 696–7n.), which adds potency to these isolated phrases portending disaster. Emendation is thus not required (*véas coni.* Dawe (1968) 9, *STS* 1 137–8). The alternative 'without apparent cause' (Campbell, *prob.* De Jong (2006) 88–9) weakens the sense to avoid changing the focalisation. For the cognate accusative ἐξόδους ἔρπειν cf. 290, Davies on *Tr.* 159 ἀγώνας ἐξίω.

288–94 The reported exchange between Tecmessa and Ajax gives an insight into their relationship. Tecmessa is not afraid to question Ajax's behaviour with some vehemence (partly reflected in her colloquial language), and is rhetorically competent enough (and familiar enough with military discipline) to convey pointed objections in a few sharp words. Ajax does not deign to argue, referring simply (and still more briefly) to her subordinate position as a woman; and Tecmessa swiftly realises that further opposition is futile. For this domestic dispute cf. Ar. *Lys.* 514–15, where Lysistrata has just asked her husband about Assembly business: “τί δὲ σοὶ ταῦτ’;” ἢ δ’ ὅς ἂν ἀνὴρ· | “οὐ σιγήσει;” κἀγὼ σίγων. Contrast Andromache at Eur. *Tr.* 654–5, who boasts γλώσσης τε σιγὴν ὄμμαθ’ ἥσυχον πόσει | παρείχων. (For speech within speech in tragedy see further Nünlist (2002) 223–5; for possible colloquialisms within it see Bers (1997) 71, Collard (2005a) 355–6.)

288–9 κἀγὼ πῖπλήσω καὶ λέγω, “τί χρῆμα δρᾷς, | Αἴας;” ‘And I rebuke him and say “What are you doing, Ajax?”’ Tecmessa's query is for Masstronarde (1979) 13–14 the eponymous ‘epiplectic’ question, one ‘used to rebuke, browbeat, or admonish another person’. ἐπιπλήσω recurs in tragedy at *OC*

1729/30 τί τόδ' ἐπέπληξας; (Antigone to Ismene) and [Aesch.] *PV* 80 (Kratos to Hephaestus); it is found in epic and prose, but not comedy. But τί χρῆμα; is possibly everyday or colloquial language (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1306, Stevens (1976) 21–2, Collard (2005a) 361). For the variant Αἴαν see 89–90n.

289–91 “τί τήνδ' ἄκλητος οὐθ' ὑπ' ἀγγέλων | κληθεὶς ἀφορμᾶς πείραν οὔτε του κλυών | σάλπιγγος; ἀλλὰ νῦν γε πᾶς εὐδαι στρατός.” “‘Why are you starting on this expedition unbidden, when you have not been summoned by messengers nor heard any trumpet? All the army is now asleep’” (Lloyd-Jones, adapted). For the idea cf. *Tr.* 391–2 δδ' ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἐμῶν ὑπ' ἀγγέλων | ἀλλ' αὐτόκλητος ἐκ δόμων πορεύεται, Aesch. *Cho.* 838 ἦκα μὲν οὐκ ἄκλητος ἀλλ' ὑπάγγελος, Eur. *Andr.* 561–2, Asclepiades *A.P.* 5.164.3 = 868 *HE* κληθεὶς, οὐκ ἄκλητος, ἐλήλυθα. Hyperbaton emphasises τήνδ', through its separation from its corresponding noun (Fraenkel (1977) 10) and its prominent fronting well before its governing verb (Dik (2007) 133–4). The effect is one of extreme surprise, as in line 42 and the English ‘What is this that you are doing here?’, compared by Dik. According to Fraenkel (1983) 438, τήνδε marks a contrast between this unusual πείρα and others, but the parallel in 42 tells against this. For the cognate accusative ἀφορμᾶς πείραν see 285–7n.

The repetition ἄκλητος . . . κληθεὶς, where the two words are not syntactically parallel, may possibly suggest colloquial or hurried expression. ἀκαιρος (*coni.* Herwerden (1862) 111) unhelpfully gives an explicit value judgment on Tecmessa's part, not found elsewhere in this exchange. She points out the facts, and leaves Ajax to assess them.

The minority variant ἐφορμᾶς gives the wrong sense (‘rouse’). Aorist κλυών for manuscript κλύων is owed to Kamerbeek¹ (p. vii; 151–3n.): responding to the trumpet takes place after hearing it. For the ancient trumpet see 15–17n.; for its use in a military context see Krentz (1991), West (1992) 119 with n. 179, and Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 1001, adding fr. 389 *TrGF* ἀσάλπικτον ὥραν, Simon. fr. 7.4 *IEG* ὑπὸ σάλ[πιγγος, Ant. Sid. *A.P.* 6.46.1, 6.159.1 = 174, 178 *HE*.

292 ὁ δ' εἶπε πρὸς με βαί, αἶ δ' ὑμνούμενα ‘But he spoke to me words few in number, though often repeated.’ Ajax often has recourse to γινῶμαι when speaking to Tecmessa (cf. 580, 581–2, 586, E. Wolf (1910) 88), closing down debate by citing proverbial wisdom which is not easily challenged. ὑμνέω implies frequent repetition (by people in general, and Ajax in particular): cf. *El.* 382n., Eur. fr. 661.10–12 *TrGF* αἶ . . . | ὑμνεῖ τὸν αὐτὸν μῦθον, Theodectes 72 F 1a *TrGF* σαφῆς μὲν ἐν βροτοῖσιν ὑμνεῖται λόγος | ὥς οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἀθλιώτερον φυτὸν | γυναικός, Eur. *Phoen.* [438] πάλαι μὲν οὖν ὑμνηθέν, ἀλλ' ὁμως ἐρῶ, Pl. *Prot.* 343b ταῦτα ἃ δὴ πάντες ὑμνοῦσιν, *Resp.* 549d, Ter. *Phorm.* 495 *cantilenam eandem canis*.

Diggle *ap.* Dawe³ (and in an unpublished note) suggests πρὸς ἐμέ, which would give the stressed pronoun expected after a preposition (K–B 1 347,

Chandler (1881) 270–1; Diggle compares *Tr.* 4, *OR* 537, *OC* 26 for the split resolution). There are, however, attestations of πρὸς με in prose and drama (Eur. *El.* 347, *Ba.* 805), as well as a few of other combinations (e.g. Aesch. *Eum.* 101 ὑπέρ μου); none of the poetic instances is metrically guaranteed, but it is unsafe to emend them all. I do print Diggle’s σοί at 562, since that does not change the paradoxos. Cf. *OR* 155, where editors have long printed σοί in the same phrase.

293 “γύναι, γυναιξὶ κόσμον ἢ σιγὴν φέρει.” “Woman, silence is an adornment to women.” For the thought cf. Eur. *Held.* 476–7, *Hipp.* 394–9, Semon. fr. 7.90–1 *IEG*, Thuc. 2.45.2, Men. fr. 820 *PCG*, [Men.] *Sent.* 139 γυναιξὶ πάσαις [γυναικὶ πάσῃ] κόσμον ἢ σιγὴν φέρει, Plaut. *Rud.* 1114 *lacita bonast mulier semper quam loquens*, Gilleland (1980) 182 n. 15, McClure (1999) 19–24.

‘The repetition of the word for woman . . . emphasize <s> the fact that a repressive male is laying down the ground rules for female behaviour’ (Morwood (2008) 19). γύναι, unlike English ‘woman’, is a standard and inoffensive form of address (*El.* 769n.). A variant γυναικί is found in the papyrus (with ξ above the line) and in Arist. *Pol.* 1260a30. We may as well print the better attested reading. Fraenkel (1983) 438 prefers the plural on the ground that Ajax’s maxim is harsher if it expresses a general misogyny; but the singular too is of universal application (e.g. Eur. *Held.* 476–7).

For σιγὴ as a κόσμος cf. fr. 64 *TrGF* ῥῆσις βραχεῖα τοῖς φρονούσι σώφρονα | πρὸς τοὺς τεκόντας καὶ φυτεύσαντας πρέπει, | ἄλλως τε καὶ κόρη τε κάργεια γένος, | αἷς κόσμος ἢ σιγὴ τε καὶ τὰ παῦρ ἔπη, Eur. fr. 219.1 κόσμος δὲ σιγῇ [Ellis, *prob.* Diggle (1997) 102: –ῆς Stobaeus], στέφανος ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ, Kranz (1955) with 27 n. 1, Dyck on Cic. *Off.* 1.93 (*temperantia* and *modestia* as an *ornatus vitae*); contrast Bacchyl. 3.94–6 πράξα[ντι] δ’ εὖ | οὐ φέρει κόσμ[ον] σιωπᾶ. For praise of silence more generally see Pearson on fr. 81. For κόσμον φέρει (where κ. is abstract: contrast 1408) cf. Hdt. 8.60, 8.142.2, Diller (1956) 59 = (1971) 85.

This line, or part of it, may have first occurred in Aeschylus: see Radt on Aesch. fr. dub. 470 *TrGF*.

294 κἀγὼ μαθοῦς’ ἔληξ’, ὁ δ’ ἐσσύθη μόνος. ‘And I took my lesson and fell silent, but he rushed off alone.’ For μόνος predicated of Ajax see 29–31n. The aorist of σεύω is ἐσσύθην in epic, lyric, and tragic dialogue in our passage and at fr. 314.49 *TrGF* ἐπεσσύθην, 314.4 ἔ]πεσσύθην. The three other classical instances in the aorist indicative all have a single sigma: Eur. *Hel.* 1302 (lyr.), Cratinus fr. 171.24 *PCG* (anap.), and Pl. *Crat.* 412b ἐσύθη (cited as a poetic word). The counterintuitive distribution (we would expect the distinctively epic/lyric form in tragic lyric, not dialogue) probably arises from the metrical awkwardness of ἐσύθη in trimeters (thus MLW).

295 καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖ μὲν οὐκ ἔχω φράζειν πάθας· ‘And as for what happened there, I can give no indication.’ Tragic messengers often delimit the extent of their knowledge: cf. *OR* 1251 χῶπῳ μὲν ἐκ τῶνδ’ οὐκέτ’ οἶδ’ ἀπόλλυται, *Ant.* 249–52, *OC* 1656–62, De Jong (2007a) 289–90, and contrast *El.* 762n.

φράζειν is in JJa, while other manuscripts have λέγειν. J also preserves the truth at *El.* 1275. (According to Küster, iii p. 2, and Toup (1760–6) iii 2, the *Suda* s.v. πάθας reads φράζειν; this is not a printing error or conjecture, since Küster notes the difference from the established text in a footnote. But in Adler’s edition (π 20 = iv 2.13–14) the lemma cites S.’s line with λέγειν, and no variants are recorded. Gaisford in his edition (ii 2806 note e) explicitly states that his manuscripts A, B, and C have λέγειν and not φράζειν.) Dawe, *STS* i 138, plausibly argues that λέγειν was originally a gloss on φράζειν (cf. Hesych. φ 829, 830, 837, 841, 844 = p. 178 H/C), which insinuated its way into the text of most manuscripts (28n.; cf. 884, where again a pair of late manuscripts preserve the truth). The otherwise inexplicable text of G, οὐ λέγειν ἔχω, can now be put down to the entry of λέγειν in an earlier position (cf. *OR* 1155 τί προσχρήζεις [Blaydes: –ζων codd.] μαθεῖν; where O’s τί πρὸς ἑμοῦ χρήζων μαθεῖν; shows the intrusion of a gloss ἑμοῦ). The reverse corruption is not so easily explained.

The minority variant τύχας (for πάθας) may be a simplification of the sense, perhaps encouraged by the ending of 283.

296–7 ἔσω δ’ ἐσῆλθε συνδέτους ἄγων ὁμοῦ | ταύρους, κύνας βοτῆρας, εὐερόν τ’ ἄγραν. ‘He came in, bringing with him fettered bulls, shepherd dogs, and fleecy prey.’ εὐερον for transmitted εὐκερων is owed to Schneidewin (1848a). (EYK is visible on the online papyrus image, *pace* Hunt (1927a) 131, who writes that the traces ‘are perhaps rather more suggestive of ε than κ, but they may be deceptive’. εὐκερον in Q is more likely to be a corruption from εὐκερων than from εὐερον.) The paradosis (‘horned prey’) must refer either to sheep, cows, or goats (but this would be an intolerable way of distinguishing them from bulls), bulls (which gives ‘he brought back bulls, dogs, and bulls’), or both (which has both the stated disadvantages). εὐερος recurs at *Ti.* 675 (εὐείρω codd.: –έρω Lobeck), Cratinus fr. 181 *PCG*, Ar. *Av.* 121. The error will have arisen from εὐκερων ἄγραν ἔχων in 64, encouraged by the mention of bulls earlier in the line.

For the arrangement ‘A, B, and C’ (rather than ‘A, B, C’ or ‘A, and B, and C’) see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1432–3, West (1990) 196. The line is an ascending tricolon both in length of description and stylistic register; there is no point in breaking this arrangement by printing ταύροις (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 2). For εἶσω vs. ἔσω see 235–6n. For ἄγω see 233–4n.

298–300 καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἠϋχένιζε, τοὺς δ’ ἄνω τρέπων | ἐσφαζε κάρραχιζε, τοὺς δὲ δεσμίους | ῥικίζεθ’ ὥστε φῶτας ἐν ποίμναις πίτνων. ‘And some he cut

through the neck, while others he turned on their backs, cut their throats, and hacked through their spines; while others he tortured while bound as if they were men, in his onslaughts on the flocks.’ This is the scene described, more briefly, by Tecmessa at 235–6; as in that passage, the variety of verbs conveys the intensity of the violence.

L’s ἔσφαξε for ἔσφαξε shows the same error as at 235. For the sense of κάρραχιζε see 56n.; for the corruption to single rho cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 610. For Sophoclean instances of ὥστε in the sense of ὥσπερ see Redondo (2003) 421 with n. 23. For the accentuation of πίτων see 56–8n.

301–5 ‘Restlessness was an accepted symptom of madness’ (Bond’s edition of Euripides’ *Heracles*, p. 310 n. 1, comparing Eur. *Hipp.* 181–5, 208–38; add the description of madmen at Hippocr. *Morb. Sacr.* 1 as ἀναίσχοντάς τε καὶ φεύγοντας ἔξω καὶ παραφρονέοντάς μέχρι ἐπέγρωνται.)

301–2 τέλος δ’ ἀπάξας διὰ θυρῶν σκιᾶ τινι | λόγους ἀνέσπα ‘Finally, he darted off through the door and spouted forth words at some shadow’. ἀπάξας gives superior sense and is better attested than the variant ἐπ–, which lacks the crucial idea of motion from and presumably entered the text from 305. A few manuscripts have ὑπ–, which reduces translators to desperate straits (‘from beneath the tent’, Campbell; ‘expressing the sudden rush *forward*’, Jebb). Jebb’s claim ‘ὑπάξας . . . has, on the whole, at least as good authority as ἀπάξας’, already shaky in 1896, is now obsolete thanks to P²K. (L probably has either α or ε, corrected by a later hand to υ.)

ἀνασπάω suggests grandiloquent but undisciplined utterance: cf. Ar. *Ran.* 902–4 (εἰκός ἐστιν Αἰσχύλον) ἀνασπῶντ’ αὐτοπρέμνοισι | τοῖς λόγοισιν ἐμπεσόντα συσκεδᾶν πολλὰς ἀλινδήθρας ἐπῶν, fr. 727 *PCG* ἀνασπᾶν βούλευμα and ἀνασπᾶν γνωμίδιον, Men. fr. 324 πόθεν γάρ, ὦ φίλοι θεοί, | τούτους ἀνεσπάκασιν οὔτοι τοὺς λόγους;, Pl. *Theaet.* 180a ὥσπερ ἐκ φαρέτρας ῥηματίσκια αἰνιγματώδη ἀνασπῶντες ἀποτοξεύουσι. The comic parallels may indicate a colloquial tone. At Cic. *Tusc.* 4.52 *impotentia dictorum* is a sign of madness.

302–4 τοὺς μὲν Ἀτρειδῶν κάτα, | τοὺς δ’ ἄμφ’ Ὀδυσσεῖ, συντιθεῖς γέλων πολύν, | ὅσῃν κατ’ αὐτῶν ὕβριν ἐκτείσαιτ’ ἰών ‘some against the Atridae, some concerning Odysseus, laughing loudly at the extent of the violent vengeance inflicted on them in his raid’. For the hysterical laughter of a madman cf. Eur. *Her.* 935 ἔλεξε δ’ ἅμα γέλωτι παραπτεπληγμένω, Papadopoulou (2005) 67–8, Halliwell (2008) 17–18 with n. 40; also Hippocr. *Aphor.* 6.53 αἱ παραφροσύναι αἱ μὲν μετὰ γέλωτος γινόμεναι ἀσφαλέστεραι· αἱ δὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς ἐπισφαλέστεραι, though our passage does not reflect this particular theory. Ajax’s mad laughter became proverbial: cf. Zenob. 1.43 Αἰάντειος γέλως, referring ἐπὶ τῶν παραφρόνως γελώντων. See further Grossmann

(1968). Though he laughs now, soon Ajax (as he imagines) will have to endure his enemies' merriment (367n.).

For ἐμφί with the dative in the sense 'concerning, with regard to' cf. 340, 562, Bruhn §65, Moorhouse 96. Hunt (1927a) 131 reports that Π² reads ξυν— rather than συν—, signalling doubt by placing a dot under the letter; the manuscript currently breaks off after a trace of the preceding iota.

A few manuscripts give πολλὺν γέλων through *vitium Byzantinum*: that is, the tendency of scribes to rearrange words at the end of a line to give the accented penultimate syllable customary in Byzantine verse (*El.* 42–3n., adding FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 744; cf. 447, 764, 825).

For the orthography of ἐκτείσαιτ' (Nauck⁸ p. 183) see 112–13n. For the cognate accusative cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1263 ἀντιτείσεσθαι φόνον. The reference to the journey in ἰών is pointed given Tecmessa's earlier objections to his leaving the hut: he has *gone and done it*. We should reject Musgrave's ἐκτίσαιτ' for the same reason; the reference is to the victorious expedition, not future chastisement of Odysseus (Ajax admittedly dilated on the latter in his exchange with Athena, but αὐτῶν denotes more than one target).

For κατὰ of vengeance Pearson (1917) 64 compares Dem. 18.274 ὀργὴν καὶ τιμωρίαν κατὰ τοῦτου, 54.40; add fr. 368.2 *TrGF* τὴν κατ' Ἀργείους [—ων Ellendt] ὕβριν. Kamerbeek, followed by Taplin (1996) 191 and Revermann (2006) 59–60, suggests that συντιθεῖς γέλων πολλὺν may indicate that Ajax laughed during the prologue. So he might; but for γέλως of jeering and mockery unaccompanied by laughter cf. *Ant.* 838 οἶμοι γελῶμαι.

305–6 κἄπειτ' ἐπᾶξας αὖθις ἐς δόμους πάλιν | ἔμφρων μόλις πῶς ξὺν χρόνῳ καθίσταται. 'And then, after rushing back into the house again, in time he returned with difficulty to his senses.' For the madman's gradual realisation of what has happened see Papadopoulou (2005) 68 (comparing Eur. *Her.* 1089–1145, *Ba.* 1233–1326).

ἐπᾶξας gives better sense and is better attested than ἀπᾶξας: Ajax hastens towards Tecmessa, not away from her. The latter presumably entered the text under the influence of 301; as in that line, nonsensical ὑπ— is also attested here (Ambrosianus L 39 sup.). The papyrus reading ἐνᾶξας has won favour (cf. Fraenkel (1983) 438); for an ἐν— compound denoting motion towards followed by ἐς cf. *OR* 263 ἐς τὸ κείνου κρᾶτ' ἐνήλασθ' ἢ τύχη, Moorhouse 107–8. But it is perilous to add an unattested word to the lexica on the testimony of a manuscript containing several unique errors unaccompanied by any unique truth (Introduction p. 59).

For αὖθις . . . πάλιν see Dawe, *STS* 1 232, adding fr. 487.3 *TrGF*, Kyriakou on Eur. *IT* 377; the frequent connexion between the words militates against taking πάλιν with what follows. μόλις πῶς (elsewhere in poetry at Eur. *Suppl.* 718, and several times in prose (sometimes μόγῃς), as at Xen. *Cyr.* 1.4.8, Pl. *Resp.*

484a, *Prot.* 328d; also μόλις ποτέ at Eur. *Ion* 383, *Hel.* 896; Radt (2007) 121 gives prose examples of πώς nuancing adverbs) and ξυν χρόνῳ emphasise the slow process of Ajax's recovery, contrasting with the sudden action dominating the previous line. καθίσταται is synonymous with γίγνεται, but there may also be a hint of its frequent sense 'compose oneself' (Headlam on Herodas 1.40, comparing e.g. Eur. *Or.* 1317 πάλιν κατάστηθ' ἡσύχῳ μὲν ὀμματι, Aesch. *Pers.* 295 λέξον καταστάς, κεί στένεις κακοῖς ὀμῳς).

307–8 καὶ πλήρες ἄτης ὡς διοπτεύει στέγος, | παίσας κάρα θώουξεν. 'And when he saw that the hut was full of destruction, he struck his head and cried out.' For striking the head as a gesture of lamentation see Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 855–6. ἄτη occurs in the context of a house full of slaughtered animals at Aesch. *Ag.* 730–2 μηλοφόνιοι <σύ>ν ἅταις | δαίτ' ἀκέλευστος ἔτευξεν, | αἶματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη. The term generally denotes 'a disaster that the victim has, at least in part, brought on himself, . . . through wicked or foolish action', but can also refer to mental aberration (Sommerstein (forthcoming)); it is thus particularly potent and pointed here. The elided augment in θώουξεν is owed to Bentley (pre-1742) 245. (ἐπι)θωύσσω denotes a loud cry, as at 335 (cf. Eur. *IT* 1127, *Hipp.* 219, *Ba.* 871, *Tro.* 153, *Or.* 168, [Aesch.] *PV* 277), sometimes with the additional nuance of harshness or impatience (cf. *OC* 1624, Eur. *Hec.* 113, [Aesch.] *PV* 73, 393, 1041). Exclusively tragic in classical Greek, it later occurs at Men. *Sic.* 170, Lyc. *Alex.* 165, and Dosiadas *Bomos* 12 (p. 182 Gow).

308–9 ἐν δ' ἐρείπιοις | νεκρῶν ἐρειφθεὶς ἕζετ' ἀρνείου φόνου 'Then he fell among the fallen corpses of the slaughtered sheep and sat there.' The same expression is found at Eur. fr. 266.2 *TrGF* νεκρῶν ἐρείπια, here with a pair of genitives (53–4n.). For ἐρειφθεὶς rather than ἐριφθεὶς see Finglass (2009g) 223–4. For the adjective ἄρνειος instead of a genitive see 41n. For φόνος see 55n.

310 κόμην ἀπρίξ ὄνυξι συλλαβῶν χερί. 'grasping his hair tightly in his hands with his nails.' Neumann (1965) 86–7 gives images of people pulling out their hair in grief. The datives form an instance of the καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος construction (*El.* 99n.); Lobeck compares Eur. *Phoen.* 1374–5 δὸς ἔγχος ἡμῖν καλλίνικον ἐκ χερὸς | ἐς στέρν' ἀδελφοῦ τῆσδ' ἀπ' ὠλένης βλαεῖν. One does not strictly grasp with the nails, but ὄνυξι economically adds the idea of tearing. Bafflement over the datives presumably encouraged the weakly attested variants χερὸς and χεροῖν, which give the feeble 'with the nails of his hand(s)'. χερί is probably singular for plural, as attested in spoken verse (Eur. *IT* 799) and lyric (372–3, Aesch. *Ag.* 1559, Eur. *Andr.* 115 (v.l.), *Suppl.* 272, *Hel.* 628 περὶ τ' ἐπέτασσα χέρα φίλιον (lyric style perhaps excuses, and metre dictates, the choice of singular': Diggle (1994) 465), Simon. fr. 271.6 Poltera); cf. Latin *manumitto*.

ἀπρίξ is infrequent in classical and Hellenistic Greek: cf. fr. 354.4 *TrGF*, Pl. *Theaet.* 155e οὐ ἂν δύνωνται ἀπρίξ τοῖν χεροῖν λαβέσθαι, Sophron fr. 85

PCG = Hordern, Aratus 440 (= Eudoxus fr. 57.5 Lasserre), Theocr. 15.68, 24.55. But Aeschylus has ἀπριγδα (*Pers.* 1057, 1063) and ἀπρικτόπληκτα (*Cho.* 425, taken by Garvie to mean ‘striking and tightly clutching’, that is, ‘pulling out the hair as they strike’). For the etymology, and absence of aspiration, see Pearson on fr. 354.2 ff.

311 καὶ τὸν μὲν ἦστο πλείστον ἄφθογγος χρόνον· ‘And he sat there for a long time, without speaking.’ Cf. Plut. *Ant.* 67.1 (Antony after Actium) παρελθὼν δὲ μόνος εἰς πῶρραν ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῦ καθῆστο σιωπῇ. Hyperbaton (with the definite article, as at 780–2, Aesch. *Ag.* 861, Eur. *Hel.* 922, and with χρόνος, as at *Tr.* 248 τὸν μὲν πλείστον ἐν Λυδοῖς χρόνον, Fraenkel (1962) 136–7) may mark high register.

312–13 ἔπειτ’ ἐμοὶ τὰ δειν’ ἐπηπείλησ’ ἔπη, | εἰ μὴ φανοίην πᾶν τὸ συντυχὸν πάθος. ‘Then he threatened me with those dreadful words, if I didn’t reveal the whole story of the disaster.’ For the compression (‘he threatened that he would harm me, if I didn’t tell him’) cf. *Ant.* 413–14 ἐγερτὶ κινῶν ἄνδρ’ ἀνὴρ ἐπιρρόθοις | κακοῖσιν, εἴ τις τοῦδ’ ἀφειδήσοι πόνου, *Phil.* 374–6 εὐθύς ἤρασσον κακοῖς | τοῖς πᾶσιν . . . | εἰ τὰμὰ κείνος ὅπλ’ ἀφαιρήσοιτό με, Moorhouse 235. As in those passages, we need a future optative, which for this verb is φανοίην (XrZf, *coni.* Pierson, in his edition of Moeris, p. 326, and Toup *q.v.* Anonymous C (1817) 372); Xr also contains a scholium explaining the form (Dawe, *STS* 1 138). Since this is apparently the only example of a contracted future optative (thus Rutherford’s Phrynichus, pp. 448–9), its ‘correction’ into the more familiar aorist optative passive φανείην was almost inevitable.

In τὰ δεινὰ . . . ἔπη ‘the article makes the description more immediate, the words being vividly in the speaker’s memory’ (Moorhouse 144); cf. 650, 1226, *Ant.* 408 πρὸς σοῦ τὰ δειν’ ἐκεῖν’ ἐπηπείλημένοι, Eur. *Phoen.* 179, Bruhn §89. (MD contrasts *OR* 513–14, where the article is missing because Creon does not know what the words were.) For ‘locutions in which the verb carries the meaning and ἔπος, λόγος etc. are empty or support a colouring adj<ective>’ see Collard on Eur. *Suppl.* 542 κάμοι μὲν ἦλθες δειν’ ἀπειλήσων ἔπη.

[314 κἀνήρετ’ ἐν τῷ πράγματος κυροῖ ποτε.] ‘And he asked in what situation he was.’ Nauck⁴ p. 181 deletes the line as ‘a weak and superfluous appendage’ (‘ein sehr überflüssiges und mattes Anhängsel’). More precisely, Reeve (1973) 160 condemns it because it ‘adds nothing to 312–13 and is unutterably tame by comparison: Ajax is not asking but threatening, and it is his threats that terrify Tecmessa (315)’. It could have arisen thanks to a desire for a verb of asking to motivate Tecmessa’s response; perhaps the compressed construction in 312–13 prompted the confusion.

For the partitive genitive ἐν τῷ πράγματος cf. *Ant.* 1229 ἐν τῷ συμφορᾷς διεφθάρης; *El.* 168–70n., Eur. *Hel.* 1195 ἐν τῷ δὲ κείσῃ συμφορᾷς; The variant

πράγματι resulted from failure to understand the construction (cf. 1146). Manuscripts are split between κυροῖ and κυρεῖ; Willmott (2000) 5–20 argues for the optative in most other such constructions in S. ποτέ reflects original ποῦ ποτ' εἰμι πράγματος; (thus Reeve (1973) 160 n. 34).

315–16 κἀγώ, φίλοι, δέισασα τοῦξειργασμένον | ἔλεξα πᾶν ὅσονπερ ἐξηπιστάμην. 'And I, my friends, in my fear, told him everything that had been done, as far as I knew it.' Tecmessa uses the address φίλοι to gain the chorus's sympathy, since she is about to mention an action which may have caused Ajax further psychological trauma (thus Hermann¹).

317–22 'The Greeks were inclined to express grief noisily and extravagantly, weeping when disappointed or humiliated. . . . None the less, the valorous man could refuse to weep or to abase himself by pleading' (Dover (1974) 167, with examples); for the latter idea see Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 947–53, Wærn (1985) (on tears in epic). Cf. 545–7n.

317–18 ὁ δ' εὐθύς ἐξώμωξεν οἰμωγὰς λυγράς, | ἄς οὔποτ' αὐτοῦ πρόσθεν εἰσήκουσ' ἐγώ. 'Straightaway he shouted out terrible cries, which I had never heard from him before.' Tecmessa uses similar language at 410–11. For the ominous nature of unprecedented behaviour cf. *Tr.* 157–8 λείπει παλαιὰν δέλτον ἐγγεγραμμένην | ξυνθήμαθ', ἅμοι πρόσθεν οὐκ ἔτλη ποτέ.

319–20 πρὸς γὰρ κακοῦ τε καὶ βαρυψύχου γόους | τοιοῦσδ' αἶε ποτ' ἄνδρὸς ἐξηγεῖτ' ἔχειν. 'For he always used to teach that such cries were the mark of a cowardly and spiritless man.' βαρύψυχος, otherwise unattested until the Imperial period, denotes a permanent character trait, that of dejection; cf. βαρύθυμος, which refers to a mood (see Lobeck's n., Zuntz (1960) 39 with n. 6 = (1972) 86 with n. 6, Hopkinson on Call. *Hym.* 6.80). Dawe³ prints βραχυψύχου, suggested by Seyffert; but neither this nor βραχύθυμος is attested.

ἔχειν is an epexegetic infinitive ('laments proper for a coward to have'; cf. 203–4n.). Herwerden suggests ἐξηγεῖτο χεῖν (p. 170 n. 1 of his edition of *OR*), but the contracted form of the simplex verb is not attested in S. or Euripides (thus MDR). The infinitive depending on ἐξηγεῖτ' is understood, as the copula often is with πρὸς + genitive = 'in the nature of' (cf. 581, 1071, *El.* 401, Aesch. *Ag.* 592, Eur. *Her.* 585, Bruhn §72.1). Alternatively, ἔχειν depends on ἐξηγεῖτ', as if it were εἶναι (thus Σ p. 93). But there is no good parallel for ἔχειν in this sense. Jebb cites e.g. Hdt. 2.91.4 ἀγῶνα γυμνικόν . . . διὰ πάσης ἀγωνίης ἔχοντα, where ἔχειν is tightly integrated with the adverbial element; here, however, word order tells against associating ἔχειν with πρὸς . . . κακοῦ τε καὶ βαρυψύχου. For αἶε intensified by ποτέ see 194b–195n. ἐξηγεῖτο 'implies authoritative exposition' (Jebb); Ajax, it seems, has never lacked confidence in enunciating ethical principles (cf. 293).

321–2 ἀλλ' ἀψόφητος δέξων κωκυμάτων | ὑπεστέναζε ταῦρος ὥς βρυχώμενος. 'But without the sound of shrill lamentations, he would groan deeply like a bellowing bull.' For Ajax compared to animals cf. 1253–4n. For the negative compound adjective followed by a genitive cf. 601/3–603/4, 910, 1326–7, *El.* 36n. Since δέξυς refers to pitch, ὑπο– probably has the same referent. The alternative, that it denotes volume (cf. 1001 ('restraining the vehemence of his grief' – Jebb), *El.* 79, *Ar. Ach.* 162 ὑποστένοισι μὲντ' ὁ θρανίτης λεῶς ('moan' Olson) is ruled out by βρυχώμενος ('used of bulls, lions, the sea, and men in agony' – Dover on *Ar. Ran.* 823; cf. Hes. *Th.* 832 τάυρου ἐριβρύχεω), which could not be predicated of a quiet animal.

Triclinius writes μυκώμενος on the ground that it is the more suitable (κάλλιον) word to denote the noise of a bull (p. 339.13–15 Dindorf); but the doctrine of the grammarians that μύκημα is proper to bulls, βρύχημα to lions (cf. [Ammon.] *Adf. voc. diff.* 507 = pp. 130–1 Nickau, *De Imp.* 2 = p. 139), does not correspond to classical usage.

323–5 νῦν δ' ἐν τοιᾷδε κείμενος κακῇ τύχῃ | ἄσιτος ἀνὴρ, ἄποτος, ἐν μέσοις βοτοῖς | σιδηροκμησιν ἥσυχος θακεῖ πεσών. 'But now, laid low by this evil fate, the man sits quietly where he has fallen, without food, without drink, in the midst of beasts slain by the sword.' Fasting is a response to trauma (cf. *Eur. Med.* 24 κείται δ' ἄσιτος (Medea), *Hipp.* 135–8, 275, 277 (Phaedra), *Suppl.* 1105–6, *Or.* 39–42, 189, Rutherford (1982) 159 n. 66 = Cairns (2001) 288 n. 66), and sitting down can be a sign of grief (see Richardson on *Hom. Hym.* 2.197–201); the absence of nourishment and physical activity additionally hints at the condition of a corpse. For the repetition of alpha-privative adjectives see *El.* 164–5n., adding Richardson on *Hom. Hym.* 2.200. For ἀνὴρ (Brunck) see 9–10n. The suffix in σιδηροκμησιν (< κάμνω) is almost exclusively tragic: cf. ἀνδροκμής (*Aesch. Suppl.* 678, *Cho.* 889, *Eum.* 248, 956, *Eur. Suppl.* 525), δουρικμής (*Aesch. Cho.* 365), and ἀκμής (*Ant.* 352/3, *Hom. Il.* 11.802, 15.697). For the vocalism of θακεῖ see 105–6n.

326 καὶ δηλὸς ἐστὶν ὥς τι δρασεῖων κακόν. 'And it is clear that he plans some terrible action.' Ajax's very silence (325 ἥσυχος) is ominous: cf. *Ant.* 1251–2 ἐμοὶ δ' οὖν ἦ τ' ἄγαν σιγῇ βαρὺ | δοκεῖ προσεῖναι, 1256 καὶ τῆς ἄγαν γὰρ ἐστὶ πον σιγῆς βάρος, also perhaps *Tr. Adesp.* fr. 18 *TrGF* σιγῶ· σιωπῇ δ' ἐστὶ τοῦ θυμοῦ τροφή. The implication is that the κακόν will be directed at Ajax himself, but it would be tactless and ill omened to say this in so many words; see also the next n. Pearson on fr. 991 lists Sophoclean instances of desiderative verbs; see further Wackernagel (1887) 141–5, (1892a) 1112 = (1953–79) I 623–7, III 1605. For otiose ὥς cf. *Ant.* 242 δηλοῖς δ' ὥς τι σημαίνων νέον, *OC* 630 ὥς τελῶν ἐφαίνετο, Moorhouse 261; from prose Nauck cites *Xen. An.* 1.5.9, *Lys.* 12.90.

[327 τοιαῦτα γάρ πως καὶ λέγει κώδύρεται.] ‘For such things, I suppose, he both speaks and laments.’ Nauck⁴ deletes the line, which is blatantly inconsistent with the claim that Ajax is now sitting ἥσυχος (325); he argues (p. 181) that it was modelled on 383. West (1978a) 109 compares *OR* 1074–5, *Ant.* 1244–5, and *Tr.* 813–14 for effective silences, in each case heralding suicide, by characters experiencing the sudden revelation of intense grief. Similar interpolation has occurred at Eur. *Med.* 37, where after δέδοικα δ’ αὐτὴν μὴ τι βουλεύσῃ νέον our manuscripts contain six lines correctly deleted by Dindorf.

328–9 ἀλλ’, ὦ φίλοι, τούτων γὰρ οὔνεκ’ ἐστάλην, | ἀρήξατ’ εἰσελθόντες, εἰ δύνασθέ τι. ‘But friends – since this is why I set out – go in and help, if you have any power.’ Tecmessa’s request will be forestalled by Ajax’s entrance on the ekkyklema at 348 (Mastronarde (1979) 108; cf. 113); MLW compares the entry of Clytemnestra on the ekkyklema at Aesch. *Ag.* 1372, similarly anticipating the chorus’s entry into the skene. In the meantime, ‘since the audience knows that the chorus cannot go in, the redirection of attention [*sc.* to the door] creates an expectation that someone will come out, and it is not hard to guess who’ (H/OK (2007) 367). For ἀλλά introducing an imperative see n. on 194a. Tragedy uses οὔνεκα, not εἵνεκ’, into which the former is corrupted in a few manuscripts here and at 1113 (cf. Wackernagel (1887) 126–30 = (1953–79) 1 608–12). For ‘if you can’ in requests and prayers cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.393 εἰ δύνασσάι γε, Mark 9.22.

330 φίλων γὰρ οἱ τοιοῖδε νικῶνται λόγοις. ‘For men such as these are won over by the words of their friends.’ For the thought cf. *OC* 1193–4 (some people) νουθετούμενοι | φίλων ἐπωδαῖς ἐξεπᾶδονται φύσιν, Hom. *Il.* 11.793 = 15.404 ἀγαθὴ δὲ παραφάσις ἐστὶν ἐταίρου. For the idea ‘defeated [*i.e.* persuaded] by one’s friends’ cf. 1353, 1357 (n.), Eur. fr. 220.3 *TrGF* πρὸς φίλων νικῶμενοι; also *El.* 253n.

λόγοις is found as a γράφεται-variant in Xs, as a gloss in the fifteenth-century manuscript Laudianus gr. 54 (noted by Masson (1888) 122 n. 2), and as a quotation in Stobaeus (4.48.19 = v 1013.4 W–H; identified by Stephanus (1568) 11). The majority reading φίλοι (*prob.* Lanza *ap.* Lanza and Fort (1991) 69–71) would mean that φίλων is a genitive of agent with νικῶνται, as at 1353; Aesch. *Suppl.* 1005, Eur. *Med.* 315, *Trö.* 23, *LA* 1357, *Cycl.* 454, fr. 341.1 *TrGF* χρημάτων νικωμένω, Ar. *Nub.* 1087, K–G 1 392. But while the syntax is plausible, the sense is not: we need ‘men such as these’, not ‘friends such as these’. Printing a comma before φίλοι, making it a vocative, would be inept after ὦ φίλοι in 328. The reverse corruption occurs at *Ant.* 190, where manuscript φίλους has become λόγους in Stobaeus (3.39.16.4 = III 725.3 W–H); at Eur. *Ion* 649 λόγοις is a γράφεται-variant for manuscript λόγους.

Stobaeus’ reading is also found in a manuscript or two against the rest of a tradition at Eur. *Or.* 606 (cf. Diggle (1991) 52; but only αἰεί vs αἰεί). As

N. Wilson (1976) 175 notes, ‘this extraordinary state of affairs does not necessarily prove any more than that a Palaeologan scholar read Stobaeus and noted the reading in his copy of Sophocles’.

331–2 Τέκμησσα, δεινοῖς, παῖ Τελεύταντος, λέγεις | ἡμῖν τὸν ἄνδρα διαπεφοιβάσθαι κακοῖς. ‘Tecmessa, child of Teleutas, terrible are the evils by which you tell us that the man has been driven mad.’ For the name of Tecmessa’s father see 210n. δεινοῖς for transmitted δεινά is owed to Bentley (pre-1742) 245. For the separation of the name from the vocative phrase cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 337, Diggle (1977) 123 = (1994) 167, (1981a) 41. With the transmitted text, ἡμῖν is either an indirect object after λέγεις, with a following pause (which is weak), or an ethic dative (indicating ‘assurance of close concern or involvement’ (Moorhouse 85) on the part of the chorus in Ajax’s madness), with a preceding pause (but such a dative should not be first in its clause). Bentley’s emendation allows an ethic dative (as advocated by Elmsley (1814) 358–9) without difficulty over the word order, and gives more bite to both adjective and noun (κακοῖς) by yoking them together. The corruption would have been encouraged by the hyperbaton δεινοῖς . . . κακοῖς; errors creep in thanks to a scribal tendency to take each line as a sense unit (thus Fraenkel (1977) 12).

ἡμῖν might better be written ἡμιν (thus Anonymous D (1818) 56): normally we do not expect enclitics at the start of a trimeter, but S. in several places ignores limitations associated with line boundary (985–7n.). διαπεφοιβάσθαι (from διαφοιβάζω, *hapax*) evokes the connexion between prophetic inspiration and madness (cf. [Long.] 8.4 τὸ γενναῖον πάθος . . . ὥσπερ ὑπὸ μανίας τινὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐνθουσιαστικῶς ἐκπνέον καὶ οἶονεῖ φοιβάζον τοὺς λόγους).

333–43 Cries from off-stage before the entrance of a character generate suspense (cf. *Tr.* 862 (*coni.*), Eur. *Ba.* 576–603, *Med.* 96–213, Taplin (1977) 372, Revermann (2006) 136–7).

334–5 τάχ’, ὥς ἔοικε, μᾶλλον· ἢ οὐκ ἠκούσατε | Αἴαντος οἶαν τήνδε θωύσσει βοήν; ‘Soon, it seems, he will be worse. Or didn’t you hear what a cry this was that Ajax shouted?’ For θωύσσω see 307–8n.

337–8 ἀνὴρ ἔοικεν ἢ νοσεῖν ἢ τοῖς πάλαι | νοσήμασι ξυνοῦσι λυπεῖσθαι παρών. ‘The man appears to be either sick, or in pain as he sits there thanks to the sickness which recently afflicted him.’ In other words, Ajax is suffering because he is either still mad, or in pain as he realises what he did during his madness. Blaydes’s νοσήμασιν παροῦσι . . . ξυνών (in his first edition; cf. *OC* 7, where ξυνών is corrupted to παρών in some manuscripts) is approved by Dawe, *STS* 1 139, who argues (i) ‘παρών “being there” is outstandingly vivid’ and (ii) ‘the appropriateness of ξυνών is proved by *O.T.* 303 οἶα νόσφ’ σνέεστιν; add Eur. fr. 1079.3 *TrGF* ταύτη τῇ νόσφ’ ξυνών ἀνὴρ and *El.* 599–600n., while for πάρεμι predicated of νόσος cf. *Phil.* 765 τὸ πῆμα τοῦτο τῆς

νόσου τὸ νῦν παρόν, 734 μὼν ὄλγος ἴσχεις σῆς παρεστῶσης νόσου; But (i) παρών often bears greater weight than a literal translation might suggest (cf. 1131, 1156, 1384, A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 188). The participle ‘suggests that Ajax, seeing the carnage in the tent, is the eye-witness of his own madness’ (Campbell, after Schneidewin); cf. Jebb’s paraphrase ‘being, as he is, in the presence of his own handiwork’. This also looks forward to the tableau of Ajax sitting among the animals. (Hence we can reject πάλιν, conjectured by Nauck⁶.) As for (ii), ξυνών is predicated of an abstract in S. at *OC* 7–8 στέργειν γὰρ αἱ πάθαι με χῶ χρόνος ξυνών | μακρὸς διδάσκει, 945–6 ὅτω γάμοι | ξυνόντες ἡνρέθησαν ἀνοσιώτατοι, 1242–4 ὥς καὶ τόνδε . . . | ἔται κλονέουσιν αἰεὶ ξυνοῦσαι, *Ant.* 370/1–372 ἄπολις ὅτω τὸ μὴ καλὸν | ξύνεστι τόλμας χάριν. Moreover, if νόσος can depend on an abstract ξυνουσία (as at *Phil.* 520 τῆς νόσου ξυνουσίᾳ and fr. 88.11 *TrGF* κὰν νόσων ξυνουσίᾳ [Meineke: καὶ νοσεῖν ἐξουσία codd.]), why could νόσημα not take a participle ξυνόν?

For ἀνὴρ (Brunck) see 9–10n. For πάλαι of recent time see *El.* 676n. According to Preiser (1976) 106, the plural νοσήματα denotes the individual manifestations of Ajax’s madness, but plural for singular is at least as likely (cf. *OR* 962 νόσοις . . . ἐφθίτο).

339 ἰὼ παῖ παῖ. ‘Io, my son, my son!’ After lamenting his own condition (333, 336), Ajax laments for the individual closest to him and most obviously bound up in his disgrace. ἰὼ means ‘alas’; he is not summoning his son but expressing grief for him (thus Renehan (1992) 344).

A scholium (p. 96 Chr.) claims that Ajax addresses Teucer, and Tecmessa misunderstands him. (L1-J/W, *So.* allege a similar misunderstanding at *Tr.* 192, but there see Davies *ad loc.* and Renehan (1992) 365–6.) If correct, the idea would nicely juxtapose the differing priorities of a mother and a warrior (thus Fraenkel (1977) 13). But if παῖ refers to Teucer, Ajax would not add Τεῦκρον καλῶ in his next cry, as if introducing a new piece of information; since he cannot hear the conversation outside, he is not correcting Tecmessa’s error. Nor does the word order imply ‘It’s *Teucer* I’m calling’: cf. *Phil.* 1324 ὁμῶς δὲ λέξω· Ζῆνα δ’ ὄρκιον καλῶ, where there is no such effect. Rather, καλῶ marks the move to a new addressee, as at 831–5 and *OC* 1389–91. Finally, although one adult can refer to another (normally younger) as παῖ or τέκνον, this is not common even among siblings. It usually constitutes a marked form of address expressing, for example, a close relationship (e.g. Philoctetes to his supposed young saviour Neoptolemus at *Phil.* 300 etc., or the Corinthian shepherd to Oedipus, whom he saved as a boy, at *OR* 1030), or the giving of advice (e.g. when ‘urg<ing> restraint on folly’: thus Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 686, citing among other passages Antigone’s address to her brother Polynices at *OC* 1420, 1431). As an isolated vocative from one half-brother to another it would sound curious, especially when the addressee is not even present.

340–1 οἴμοι τάλανιν· Εὐρύσασκες, ἀμφὶ σοὶ βοᾷ. | τί ποτε μενοινᾷ; ποῦ ποτ' εἶ; τάλανιν' ἔγω. 'Oimoi, unhappy woman! Eurysaces, you are the subject of his cry. Whatever does he want? Wherever are you? Wretch that I am!' For οἴμοι see 227/8–232n. For ἀμφὶ with the dative ('concerning' rather than 'because of', *pace* Renchan (1992) 344) see 302–4n. μενοινᾷω is found in epic, elegy, and lyric, and then in tragedy (Aesch. fr. 486 *TrGF*), satyr-play (Eur. *Cycl.* 448), and comedy (Ar. *Vesp.* 1080, paratragic). Two strong pauses in 341 convey agitation (cf. *Tr.* 314–15).

342–3 Τεῦκρον καλῶ. ποῦ Τεῦκρος; ἥ τὸν εἰσαεῖ | λεηλατήσῃ χρόνον; ἐγὼ δ' ἀπόλλυμαι. 'I call on Teucer. Where is Teucer? Will he be chasing spoils forever? Meanwhile, I am perishing!' The *Iliad* refers to raiding parties undertaken by the Greeks (1.125, 1.366–7, 9.328–9); cf. Thuc. 1.11.1. At 720–1 we learn that this expedition brought Teucer to the Mysian heights. For other instances in tragedy where an individual on a mission is expected back see Taplin (1977) 124–5 n. 5.

For interrogative ἥ (thus Brunck *tacite*; later found in some manuscripts) see Denniston 282–4. Some editors print ἦ (102n.), but the emphatic particle introducing τὸν εἰσαεῖ . . . χρόνον gives better sense than an introductory 'Or will . . .', where the implied but suppressed alternative is unclear (contrast 334). For δέ 'meanwhile', often after a rhetorical question, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 118 μύζοιτ' ἄν· ἀνὴρ δ' οἴχεται φεύγων πρόσω, Xen. *An.* 3.1.13 τί κατάκειμαι; ἥ δὲ νύξ προβαίνει, Herodas 8.1–2 μέχρι τέο κείσῃ | ῥέγχουσα; τὴν δὲ χοῖρον αὐόνη δρύπτει with Headlam, Apul. *Met.* 9.5 *scine vacuus et otiosus . . . ambulabis . . . ? at ego misera pernox et per diem lanificio nervos meos contorqueo*. In each case, a question mark is truer to the Greek syntax than a comma.

344 ἀνὴρ φρονεῖν ἔοικεν. ἀλλ' ἀνοίγετε. 'The man seems to be in his right mind. Come, open the doors.' For ἀλλά introducing an imperative see n. on 194a. Plural ἀνοίγετε indicates that Tecmessa had entered with attendants, as the plural imperative cannot be addressed to a single individual. But Tecmessa alone opens the doors (cf. 346); although not directly addressed, she takes the initiative. For ἀνὴρ (Brunck) see 9–10n. For ἀνοίγετε without an object cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 877–8, Eur. *Tro.* 304, *Phoen.* 1068.

345 τάχ' ἂν τιν' αἰδῶ κάπ' ἐμοὶ βλέψας λάβοι. 'Perhaps even in my case he may look and feel some shame.' Elsewhere αἰδώς is the inhibitor, not the consequence, of eye contact (462–3n.). The chorus's expression reflects the strangeness of the situation, where Ajax's madness shields him from the αἰδώς which his acts would otherwise have generated. Eye contact with a friend, an act bound up with αἰδώς in many ways (cf. Cairns (2005b)), may restore a more usual state of affairs. For καὶ with ἐγὼ indicating modesty cf. *Ant.* 719–20 γνώμη γὰρ εἴ τις κάπ' ἐμοῦ νεωτέρου | πρόσσεστι, *OR* 1110–11 εἰ χρή

τι κάμῃ μὴ συναλλάξαντά πω, | πρέσβεις, σταθμᾶσθαι, *Phil.* 192 εἴπερ κἀγὼ τι φρονῶ. After Ajax's preceding appeal, the implication may be that Teucer would have a greater effect (so Hermann¹). Since βλέπω does not take ἐπί with the dative, and ἐπιβλέπω does not take a dative before Lucian (48.20; and even then has a different sense), ἐπ' ἐμοί means 'with respect to me' (thus Moorhouse 113), with exegetetic βλέψας (so Campbell). The alternative is to print ἐμέ (*coni.* Herwerden (1887) 70; κᾶς ἐμέ *iam* Blaydes¹); ignorance of the lengthening power of initial βλ– could have led to corruption.

346–7 ἰδοῦ, διοίγω· προσβλέπειν δ' ἔξεστί σοι | τὰ τοῦδε πράγῃ, καὶ τὸς ὥς ἔχων κυρεῖ. 'There, I am opening it. You can see his deeds, and the state of the man himself.' As often, the phrase 'the doors are open: now you can see inside' signals the imminent appearance of the ekkyklema (Taplin (1977) 443). Earlier Tecmessa had encouraged the chorus to go within (328–9n.). For πρᾶγος see 21–2n.

KOMMOS (348–429)

348–429 In the preceding *kommos* (201–62) Tecmessa had chanted, whereas the chorus first chanted and then sang. Now Tecmessa and the chorus speak their lines, as Ajax sings. (Since it is spoken and not sung, the chorus's part is probably delivered by the chorus-leader, as Gardiner (1987) 61–2 argues, or perhaps individual choreutae in turn, not the chorus as a whole.) In each case, the singer has the more openly emotional part (cf. Hall (1999) 112 ≈ (2006) 309). Ajax's lyric is on a grander scale than the chorus's; they had a single strophic pair, whereas he has three, with the last in particular reaching new heights of elaboration and intensity. His song contrasts with the spoken interventions of his friends, as they attempt to quell his frenzied grief. The use of dochmiacs for the first time also signals a more emotional tone. Singing by male characters is not as common as by women, and in this case the song is ironically prefaced by Tecmessa's account of Ajax's former distaste for loud expressions of grief (317–22; thus Hall, *ibid.* 112 ≈ 309). But song is not itself 'unmanly': lamentation is not wholly a female business (cf. Suter (2008a) 164–6), and Euripides' Theseus provides an Athenian parallel for a Salaminian singer (*Hipp.* 817–84).

The lyric begins with urgent addresses from Ajax to the chorus (348–53, 356–61); they, by contrast, are so shocked by his appearance that they address not him but Tecmessa (354–5). As the *kommos* progresses, however, Ajax 'withdraw[s] into himself' (M. Heath (1987) 179), moving via a general ὄρᾳς; (364) to invocations of himself (372), Odysseus (379–81), and Zeus (387), before he finally calls upon the Underworld (394a–395) and the Trojan landscape (412a–413). Tecmessa and the chorus attempt to check his passion; he responds angrily to Tecmessa's first intervention (368–70), but after that ignores them

almost completely (405b φίλοι is the one exception). This growing sense of disconnexion from his fellows leads into the soliloquy which begins the next episode.

The variation already present in the combination of song and speech is reinforced by a wide stylistic register, encompassing ‘language derived from the market-place’ (Burton (1980) 21; cf. 369, 381, 388–9) together with more elevated strains (especially in the third strophic pair), sometimes within the same utterance (contrast the rhythmic intensity of 364–6 with the blunt cries of 367, or ἄλγημα with δισσάρχος at 389–90). Such a range simultaneously conveys the grandeur and the bitterness of Ajax’s suffering. The content is more focussed, however; Ajax’s sole concern is with ‘the prospect of humiliation . . . the moral character of his actions is no consideration with him at all’ (Cairns (1993a) 230). He regrets not his original mission to kill the chiefs, but only its failure (372–6; cf. Biggs (1966) 224). The resulting disgrace motivates the frequent references to his own death (361, 391, 394a–399/400, 416/17–417/18); and while there is a brief mention of the likely threat from the army (408–408/9), the overwhelming emphasis of the lyric is not on external threats but on suicide. This too is taken up at greater length in the following scene.

FIRST STROPHIC PAIR (348–53 ~ 356–61)

(1) 348	356	υ—	
(2) 348/9	356/7	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2δ
(3) 349/50	357/8	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ^H	2δ
(4) 350	359	υ—υ—υ—υ—	2ia
(5) 351/2	359/60	υ—υ—υ—υ—	2ia
(6) 353	361	—υ—υ—υ—	cho ia _λ

SECOND STROPHIC PAIR (364–7, 372–6 ~ 379–82, 387–91)

(7) 364	379	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2δ
(8) 365	380	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2δ
(9) 366	381	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— ^H	2δ
(10) 367	382	—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	3ia
(11) 372	387	—υ—υ—υ—υ—	enopl
(12) 373	388	υ—υ—υ—υ—	2ia
(13) 374	389	—υ—υ—υ—υ—	cho ia
(14) 375	390	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	ia cho
(15) 376	391	υ—υ—υ—υ—	ia ia _λ

For the association of dochmiacs and iambics see my metrical analysis of *El.* 1232–87.

In (1) Willink (2001) 87 n. 93 = (2010) 377 n. 93 suggests δ for ιώ, which he takes with the following line as a single period of the form 2cr δ. But when so much of this ode is made up of pairs of dochmiacs, it is perverse to remove one.

For the enoplian colon in (11) cf. 901 ~ 947, *Ant.* 354–5 ~ 365–6, Itsumi (1991–3) 253 with n. 30. A different text would give a telesillean: neither is metrically preferable, so our choice must be made for different reasons (372–3n.).

THIRD STROPHIC PAIR (394a–408/9 ~ 412a–426/7)

(16) 394a	412a	υ —	
(17) 394b	412b	υ υ — υ —	δ
(18) 395	413	υ υ — υ — υ υ — υ — ^H	2δ
(19) 396	414	υ — υ — υ — — υ — ^H	ia δ
(20) 397/8	415/16	υ — υ — υ — — υ —	ia δ
(21) 398/9	416/17	— — υ — υ — υ —	cho enneas
(22) 399/400	417/18	υ — υ — υ — — — — ^H	2ia ^Λ ia _Λ
(23) 401a	419a	— υ — υ —	hδ
(24) 401b	419b	— υ — υ — ^H	hδ
(25) 402	420	— υ — — — —	δ
(26) 403	421	— υ — υ —	hδ
(27) 404	422	— υ — υ — ^H	hδ
(28) 405a	423	— υ — υ — ^H	hδ
(29) 405b	423/4	— υ — υ —	hδ
(30) 406	424	— υ — υ —	hδ
(31) 407	425	— — υ — υ — υ — ^H	2ia
(32) 408	426	— — υ — υ — υ —	2ia
(33) 408/9	426/7	υ — υ — —	reiz

The above analysis of (16)–(17) (first printed by Hermann¹) gives an *extra metrum* exclamation, as at (1), followed by an opening dochmiac making up a single period. For this cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 143 ~ 149, Eur. *Or.* 1353 ~ 1537; note also the single hypodochmiacs later in the stanza, and cf. Stinton (1977b) 46–7 = (1990) 334–6 and Medda (2000) on period-end within sequences of dochmiacs. The alternative *ia cr* gives split resolution in both strophe and antistrophe (cf. L. Parker (1968) 259). For Willink's deletion of (16) see 394a–395n.

At (19) repetition occurs in the same place in strophe and antistrophe: cf. 879/80 ~ 925/6, *El.* 489n., Rzach (1874) 24–7.

For the colon at (21) cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 59 ~ 64, Eur. *Alc.* 443 ~ 453 (*Tr.* 637 ~ 644 υ — υ — — — υ — may be different because of the long sixth syllable). As Itsumi (1991–3) 254 notes, it is either enoplian (i.e. related to cola like υ υ — υ — υ — —) or aeolo-choriambic (cf. the hagesichorean, x — υ — υ — υ — —). The former is more likely (as certainly for the *Alcestis* example, because of the strongly enoplian surroundings), since that metre is more suited than aeolo-choriambic to a dochmiac context (Itsumi p. 255). The ode contains no aeolo-choriambic except for the closing reizianum at (33) (a clausula found in a variety of contexts; cf. 914 ~ 960).

(23–4) and (26–30) show sequences of hypodochmiacs, as at *OR* 1208a–1209a ~ 1217a–1218; there are several confirmed instances of period-end. The colometry of (28–9) is owed to Mueller (1878) 14–15 (*prob.* Stinton (1977a) 127 = (1990) 271). It brings the passage into line with the metre of the preceding part of the stanza, and provides the final long syllable for οὔτινᾱ in 423/4 required by responsion. Other attempts to effect the latter result in various contortions. (i) West (1978b) 241 accepts lengthening at word boundary before mute and liquid, but this very rare prosody, when it does occur, almost always involves close syntactic connexion between the words (*El.* 853n.). (ii) Hermann¹ suggests οὔτιν' ἔ, but the definite article 'would be unidiomatic in this lyric style' (Dawe (1988) 107 = (2007) 145). (iii) Dawe² and (1988) 107 = (2007) 145 emends to οὔτιν' ᾠλιον on the basis of a supposed intrusive gloss (28n.), but this ingenious solution is hardly to be preferred to the simpler change of colometry. On the text of these passages (especially vexed in the strophe) see further 405a–408/gn.

At (25) the transmitted text offers υυυυ — — in the strophe, — υυ — — in the antistrophe: a dochmiac with resolved anceps responding with one with long anceps. Of the alleged parallels for this cited by West (1982) 111 (cf. Dodds on Eur. *Ba.* 997–1001), the Euripidean examples are either not dochmiac or can be easily emended (see Barrett's edition of Euripides' *Hippolytus*, p. 434 and Diggle (1977) 123 = (1994) 167, (1984b) 68 = (1994) 314–15), while the series at fr. 269c.27–9 *TrGF* 'is no analogy for an isolated instance of the colon among regular dochmii' (Barrett) and is probably from a satyr-play (rightly stressed by Renehan (1992) 345). Moreover, as Willink (2002) 56 = (2010) 390–1 notes, none of the alleged parallels involves responsion of υυ to —, or of dochmiacs with two further shorts after the initial resolved anceps. In this ode all the other dochmiacs in the second two strophic pairs show exact responsion. It is curious that this strictness should be broken in the very place where we have reason to doubt the metre on other grounds. δλέθριον is thus probably corrupt: see 401a–402n. for possible emendations.

Ajax enters from the skene, covered in blood and sitting on the ekkyklema, and surrounded by representations of the slaughtered animals. For the ekkyklema, a wheeled platform used to represent interior scenes, see Taplin (1977) 442–3, Belardinelli (2000) 243–9, and A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 96. Ajax's words at 350–3 indicate a shocking visual tableau; the chorus's appalled but undetailed response (354–5) indicates that the audience can see the tableau, since if it could not, the chorus would need to describe it (thus Gardiner (1987) 61–2 n. 22). Ajax probably remains sitting throughout until his exit at 595 (Taplin (1978) 108); he never leaves the ekkyklema, as that would signify his leaving the hut.

348–349/50 ἰὼ | φίλοι ναυβάται, μόνοι ἐμῶν φίλων, | μόνοι ἔτ' ἐμμένοντες
 ὀρθῶ νόμῳ 'Hail, dear sailors, who alone of my friends, alone still abide by
 righteous custom'. A new entrant usually begins by addressing an actor, not
 the chorus (Mastronarde (1979) 26–7); Ajax turns first to his fellow sailors (cf.
 356–357/8; 201, 901–2). Behind his words lies the proverbial idea that a man
 afflicted by disaster is abandoned by his friends: cf. Eur. fr. 799a *TrGF* ἀνδρὸς
 κακῶς πρᾶσσοντος ἐκποδῶν φίλοι with Kannicht's n. ἰὼ opens a similarly
 intense greeting from a desperate man to his only comrades at *OR* 1321–1323/4
 ἰὼ φίλος, | σὺ μὲν ἐμὸς ἐπίπολος ἔτι μόνιμος· ἔτι γὰρ | ὑπομένεις με τὸν τυφλὸν
 κηδεύων; cf. also *Phil.* 219 ἰὼ ξένοι.

μόνος, often predicated of Ajax (29–31n.), is now applied to another (as at
 359). The effect is to stress the protagonist's isolation: only the chorus have
 stood by him. Repetition at the beginning of successive dochmiacs emphasises
 the word (cf. 879/80, 925/6, Diggle (1984a) 65 = (1994) 297). Further promi-
 nent repetition, again with reference to the chorus, recurs in the antistrophe
 at 359 (although for the sake of variety this is neither in the corresponding line,
 nor at the start of successive dochmiacs).

ἔτ' for transmitted τ' is owed to Reiske (1753–69). τ' would (i) give a dochmiac
 with no instances of resolution corresponding to one with two (in 357/8),
 which is unparalleled (cf. West (1982) 109–10), and (ii) connect two unequal
 phrases, only the second of which contains a participle. ἔτ' removes both
 problems, the latter by putting the two instances of μόνοι in apposition (as
 in 22 of the 23 examples cited by Diggle (above) of repetition at the start of
 adjacent dochmiacs, Eur. *Or.* 180 ὑπὸ γὰρ ἀλγέων ὑπὸ τε συμφορᾷς being
 the exception). The corruption it introduces is unproblematic in this metre
 (*El.* 1239n.); while the word is idiomatic in the context (cf. ἔτι μόνιμος in the
OR passage cited above). For the corruption cf. Eur. *Hec.* 79–81 σώσατε παῖδ'
 ἐμόν, | ὅς μόνος οἰκῶν ἄγκυρ' ἔτ' [*coni.*: –ρά τ' codd.] ἐμῶν | τὴν χιονώδη
 Θρήκην κατέχει.

350–3 ἰδεσθὲ μ' οἶον ἄρτι κύμα φοινίας ὑπὸ ζάλης | ἀμφίδρομον κυκλεῖται.
 'See what a wave, accompanied by a bloody storm, now circles around me.'
 The κύμα ἀμφίδρομον accompanied φοινίας ὑπὸ ζάλης is both metaphorical
 (his madness and disgrace) and literal (the blood of the animals which he has
 shed and in which he has been sitting). For metaphorical κύμα etc. of madness
 see 205–7n.; for metaphorical ζάλη cf. Pind. *O.* 12.11–12a οἱ δ' ἀνιαραῖς |
 ἀντικύρσαντες ζάλαις | ἐσλὸν βαθὺ πῆματος ἐν μικρῷ πεδάμειψαν χρόνῳ.
 For madness compared to storms in general see 205–7n.

Lloyd-Jones translates φοινίας ὑπὸ ζάλης as 'sent up by a deadly surge',
 but elsewhere ζάλη denotes a storm, especially its precipitatory aspect (cf.
 Aesch. *Ag.* 656 ζάλη . . . ὁμβροκτύπῳ ('the rush of drumming rain': Fraenkel),
 [Aesch.] *PV* 371 θερμοῖς ἀπλάτου βέλεσι πυρπνόου ζάλης (i.e. the fiery rain

from Etna), Pl. *Resp.* 496d, [Hippocr.] *De Diaeta* 89.13 σφόδρα ὕεσθαι καὶ χειμῶνα καὶ ζάλην εἶναι). Aesch. *Ag.* 665 κύματος ζάλην comes closest to the sense desired by Lloyd-Jones; the literal ‘storm of the waves’ naturally enough becomes ‘squally waves’ (Collard). For ὑπό of attendant circumstances see 257–8n. Instead of ὑπό **r** has ἀπό; for the reverse corruption see 301–2n.

κυκλείται is from κυκλέω; for the difficulty of distinguishing between this verb and κυκλώ see Kassel (1979) 18–19 = (1991) 307.

354–5 οἷμ’ ὥς ἔοικας ὀρθὰ μαρτυρεῖν ἄγαν. | δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦργον ὥς ἀφροντίστως ἔχει. ‘Alas, you appear all too accurate a witness! The facts show that he is out of his mind.’ Instead of reciprocating the repeated vocatives, the chorus address their shock and apprehension to Tecmessa. Ajax’s actions have isolated him even from his comrades.

οἷμοι is elided elsewhere in tragedy at 587, *Ant.* 320, 1270, and twenty times in comedy, usually before ὥς. For ὀρθός of a witness cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 319 μάρτυρες ὀρθαί, Com. Adesp. fr. 1084.4–5 *PCG* ὦ δέσποινά Νύξ, | σε μά[ρτυρ] ὀ[ρ]θὴν ἐπάγομ’ οὗ λέγω λόγου. As Renehan (1992) 347 concludes, ἄγαν, common in tragedy and rare in prose, probably sounded poetic in Attic.

τοῦργον denotes ‘the actual tangible fact of what has been done (opp.<osed> to mere uncertain words)’ (Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1077 τὸ δ’ ἔργον οὐ λέγον σε μνηύει κακόν, citing e.g. S. fr. 388 *TrGF* τάχ’ αὐτὸ δείξει τοῦργον ὥς †ἐγὼ† [ἔχει Herwerden] σαφῶς; distinguish Eur. *Or.* 1129 εἴτ’ αὐτὸ δηλοῖ τοῦργον [‘the task’] οἱ τεῖναι χρεών). For the formation ἀφροντίστως see the works cited on *El.* 186n.

356–61 Ajax emphasises his closeness to the chorus before asking for them to kill him; cf. Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar* 5.5.25–8 ‘Good Volumnius, | Thou knowst that we two went to school together: | Even for that our love of old, I prithee | Hold thou my sword-hilts while I run on it.’

356–7/8 ἰὼ | γένος ναῖας ἄρωγόν τέχνας, | ἔλιον δς ἐπέβας ἐλίσσων πλάταν ‘Hail, race who serve the seaman’s craft, who manned the ship and plied the oar at sea’. For the closeness of the bond between Ajax and the chorus as fellow sailors, and for ἰὼ in address, see 348–349/50n. The opening phrase is reminiscent of Tecmessa’s first address to the chorus (201), although lyric embraces a more involved expression. For the word order γένος ναῖας ἄρωγόν τέχνας (AbaB) cf. 859, *El.* 730n., Diggle (1977) 110 = (1994) 152. The γένος in question is that of Salamis, as represented by its fighting men who make up the chorus (cf. 861, where Ajax refers to the Athenians as τὸ σύντροφον γένος). For the objective genitive after ἄρωγός see 201n.

ἔλιον (*coni.* Hermann (1796) 440, *prob.* Diggle (1977) 123 n. 28 = (1994) 167 n. 28) is superior to transmitted ἄλιαν since it removes a resolved initial

anceps (very doubtful in dochmiacs: see the metrical analysis of (25)) at trivial cost; Diggle cites parallels for corruption arising from confusion over two-termination adjectives (cf. 365).

For ὅς after γένος by the sense construction cf. 758–60, Bruhn §16.11. ἄλιον . . . πλάταν (cf. *OC* 716–17 ἄλία . . . | . . . πλάτα (text problematic), Eur. *Hdd.* 82, Diggle (1994) 499 n. 29) depends on ἐλίσσων; the verb ἐπέβας has its object τῆς ναὸς understood from the context. Its sense cannot be ‘embarked’ or ‘arrived’, since whatever action it denotes is contemporaneous with ἐλίσσων. This leaves ‘manned the ship’ (so Jebb in his translation). For ἐλίσσω used ‘of rotary and to-and-fro movements’ (Willink on Eur. *Or.* 171 ἀνὰ πόδα σὸν εἰλίξεις) see LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐλίσσω 1 3.

359–61 σέ τοι σέ τοι μόνον δέδορκα πημονὰν ἐπαρκέσοντ’ ἀλλὰ με συνδαίξον. ‘In you, in you alone I see a defence against misery [thus Jebb]: come, join together in killing me!’ πημονὰν for transmitted ποιμένων is owed to Reiske (1753) 3 (he writes –ήν). For ἐπαρκέω ‘ward off’ with the accusative cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.873 οὐδέ τί οἱ τό γ’ ἐπήρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον, LSJ⁹ s.v. 1 1–2. For the emotionally heightened repetition of σέ τοι, and for μόνος predicated of the chorus, see 348–349/50n.

ἐπαρκέσοντ’ refers to a future event (contrast the present tenses of 348–53), which must be Ajax’s death at the hands of the chorus. He requests such a death in the following line, believing that only this will remove the πημονή which afflicts him. ἀλλὰ in 361 marks a ‘clenching and final appeal’ (see n. on 194a), as often with imperatives, and introduces an explanation for the description of the chorus in 359–359/60 (so Schneidewin). The transmitted text translates as ‘I see that you alone of my shepherds will defend me’ (for absolute ἐπαρκέω in this sense cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 93). But while the ποίμ– stem can metaphorically denote ‘looking after’ (examples in LI-J/W, *So.* and Collard on Eur. *Suppl.* 190–1a), when applied to human relationships it always refers to overlordship (cf. West (1997) 226–7, (2007) 131). I do not know of a parallel for soldiers described as the shepherds of their leader. Moreover, one shepherd looks after a plurality of sheep; it would be perverse to apply this concept metaphorically to a case where one individual is in the charge of many overseers.

For corruption from η to οι and in reverse see Diggle (1969) 49 = (1994) 20 (JD adds *Tr.* 79, 323, *OC* 9, Eur. *Ion* 213, 253, 331, 664, 1058). Or, if original πημονήν became πειμονήν through a phonetic error (cf. the corruption of πημονή to πειπονή in Eur. fr. 682.2 *TrGF*), πειμονήν could have been read as a misspelled version of the stem ποιμέν–. More generally, ‘the corruption is especially easy in a play which is so largely concerned with sheep, and which has two of the Homeric ποιμένα λαῶν’s among its *dramatis personae*’ (Dawe (2002–3) 5 = (2007) 351); cf. the later corruption of μνηῶν to μήλων (599/600–605n.), and see further Fraenkel’s edition of Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*, III 655–6

n. 1 for scribal errors produced by a combination of mental and mechanical processes (he cites Aesch. *Pers.* 632 πέρας/πέρσαις).

Ll-J/W keep the paradosis, but fail to account for the sense of ποιμένων. They refer to *OR* 1321–1323/4, but that passage, with its present tenses, rather parallels 348–53. Their claim that ‘Ajax commends his sailors for standing by him, not for warding off perils; indeed, in the next line he asks them to kill him’ (*So.*) misses the future tense and the sense of ἄλλά. Liapis (1998) 248–9 prefers ποιμενίων, ‘flocks’, metaphorically ‘troops’, a word not attested before Oppian, which gives awkward synizesis and extraordinary sense, on the ground that it is fractionally closer to the paradosis than πημονάν. (One might have expected ποιμνίων: so Hertel (1856) 1.) His diachronic analysis of Greek vowel shifts (pp. 246–8) misses the point that not all copying errors result from phonetic confusion. The conjecture exemplifies what Kopff (1993) 156 calls ‘the poisonous quality of gentler medicines’.

συνδάξιν ‘join in killing me’ is addressed to the chorus as a group, just as συναποκτείνω at Antiph. 5.39 and Aeschin. 2.148 means ‘join with another in killing’. Another possibility is simply ‘kill’, with intensificatory συν– (cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. σύν D 1 2). Two other alternatives are less attractive: (i) ‘kill me together with the animals’, but there has been no direct reference to them for some time; (ii) ‘help me to kill myself’, but if Ajax is to be involved, he would not require assistance. My preferred sense emphasises the passive nature of his distress, as first found in Tecmessa’s speech.

362 εὐφημα φώνει ‘Speak words of good omen!’ The same phrase occurs at 591 and *El.* 1211, again prompted by utterances concerned with or implying death.

362–3 μὴ κακὸν κακῷ διδοῦς | ἄκος πλέον τὸ πῆμα τῆς ἄτης τίθει. ‘Do not apply an evil remedy to an evil and make worse the pain of your ruin.’ Similar sentiments involve polyptoton at fr. 77 *TrGF* ἐνταῦθα μέντοι πάντα τάνθρώπων νοσεῖ, | κακοῖς ὅταν θέλωσιν ἰσθαι κακά, Aesch. fr. 349 μὴ κακοῖς ἰὼ κακά (with Radt), Eur. *Her.* 1213 κακὰ... κακοῖς συνάψαι (also of prospective suicide), Gygli-Wyss (1966) 86–8, Puelma (1977) 184 n. 9. The parallels make the enjambment surprising: at first it seems that κακὸν κακῷ διδοῦς makes sense in itself (thus MDR). For τὸ πῆμα τῆς ἄτης cf. *Phil.* 765 τὸ πῆμα τοῦτο τῆς νόσου, Aesch. *Ag.* 850, Hom. *Od.* 3.152 πῆμα κακοῖο, 14.338 δῦς... πῆμα. The alternative ‘... make the pain worse than the plague that caused it’ (Lloyd-Jones) relies on an obscure distinction between τὸ πῆμα and τῆς ἄτης. Both senses receive support in the scholia (pp. 101–2 Chr.).

364–6 ὄρᾳς τὸν θρασύν, τὸν εὐκάρδιον, | τὸν ἐν δαίοις ἀτρεστον μάχας, | ἐν ἀφόβοις με θηρσί δεινὸν χέρας; ‘Do you see how I, the bold, the stout-hearted, the man who never shirks in battle with the foe, am formidable for my prowess

among beasts that frightened no one?’ For the thought cf. *Honestus* 2462–3 *GP* τ]ὸν θρασὺν ἐς μολπὴν ἄφθογγον νῦν μ’ ἐ[ς] ἀοιδίην | λεῦσσε, *Philip A.P.* 104.2 = 3091 *GP* ὅπλων γυμνὸν ἰδεῖν τὸν θρασὺν Ἡρακλέα, *Amyntes* 21–5 *FGE* (where see the apparatus) τὰν πάρος ἄτρεστον Λακεδαιμόνα, τὰς χέρα μούνας | πολλὰκίς αἶμ πο[λέμο]υ δ[ῆ]ριν ἔφριξεν Ἄρης, | νῦν ὑπ’ ἀνικάτω Φιλοποίμενι δουρί τ’ Ἀχ[α]ϊῶν | πρηνῆς ἐκ τρισσᾶν ἥριπτε μυριάδων | ἄσκε- πος. The three τόν-clauses increase in length before being capped in the final line. This listing of adjectives preceded by the article (elsewhere associated with invective: *El.* 300–2n.), is paralleled by *Ti.* 1105–6 ὁ τῆς ἀρίστης μητρὸς ὠνομασμένος, | ὁ τοῦ κατ’ ἄστρα Ζηνὸς αὐδηθεὶς γόνος, spoken by Heracles: ‘in both passages there is a poignant contrast between . . . past acknowledged glory and . . . present degradation and anguish’ (MD).

μάχας (*coni.* Blaydes¹) for transmitted μάχαις supposes the same error as in some manuscripts at [Aesch.] *PV* 416 παρθένου μάχας ἄτρεστοι. In each case, ignorance of the construction (objective genitive after an alpha-privative adjective) encouraged this slightest of corruptions. The transmitted text can be paralleled by fr. 314.244–5 *TrGF* νεῖκος . . . | δᾶ[ο]υ μάχας and by *δητῶ ἐν πολέμῳ*, found at *Hom. Il.* 5.117, *Tyrt.* 11.18 *IEG*, and [Simon.] *A.P.* 6.52.4 = 935 *FGE* (Hellenistic); cf. also Aesch. *Cho.* 430 δαῖται ἐν ἐκφοραῖς (‘[in] a foeman’s funeral’: Verrall), *Suppl.* 1063–4 γάμον . . . | δάιον (‘a marriage with the enemy’). But retaining μάχαις would probably require δαῖται, since this adjective is very rarely two-termination (*Ar. Nub.* 335, metrically guaranteed; *Eur. Her.* 915, perhaps to give a better parallel to δάιοι in 914; and possibly *Tro.* 1301, if genuine); yet δαῖται is supported by the *utrum in alterum* argument (after μάχας had become μάχαις, original δαῖται became δαῖταις in some manuscripts to agree with it; the reverse process is harder to imagine, as FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 62 note: ‘corruption of adjectival forms in –α– into forms in –ο– seems to be unusual’). Blaydes’s emendation also gives a similar pattern in 365 and 366 (ἐν + dative plural, accusative singular adjective qualifying Ajax, noun delimiting the sense of the preceding adjective), which fits the overt patterning of the rest of the sentence, and highlights the contrast between Ajax’s past and present states. The vocalism δα– is found in both lyric and dialogue in tragedy (cf. 784, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 559, Björck (1950) 128).

The minority variant ἄτρεπτος is not classical, but much the commoner in later Greek. For ἐν see 43n. The sense of ἀφόβοις is in the scholia (p. 103 Chr.); Jebb (after Erfurdt) prefers the sentimental alternative ‘fearing no harm from man’, but Ajax’s concern is with his own disgrace (at having expended such force for an inglorious purpose), not the innocence of the animals.

367 ᾧμοι γέλωτος· οἶον ὑβρίσθην ἄρα. ‘Alas for their laughter! What an outrage, it seems, I have suffered!’ In his despair Ajax imagines the laughter

of his enemies (cf. 382, 957–8, Knox (1964) 30–1, *El.* 277n.); previously he had been the one laughing (302–4n.). Public manifestation of Ajax’s ruin will generate mockery: cf. Eur. fr. 460 *TrGF* λύπη μὲν ἄτη περιπεσεῖν αἰσχροῦ τι· | εἰ δ’ οὖν γένοιτο, χρὴ περιστέλλαι καλῶς | κρύπτοντα καὶ μὴ πᾶσι κηρύσσειν τάδε· | γέλως γὰρ ἐχθροῖς γίγνεται τὰ τοιάδε. Teucer fears mockery for Ajax even after his death (988–9n.).

For the orthography of ὦμοι see 227/8–232n. For exclamations beginning οἶος cf. 503, 641/2, 923; for their combination with an exclamation see Fraenkel (1959) 15 = (1964) 1 433–4. For ὕβρις see 151–3n. For ἄρα see 233–4n.

368 μὴ, δέσποτ’ Αἴας, λίσσομαί σ’, αὖδα τάδε. ‘Do not, lord Ajax, I beg you, say these things.’ Tecmessa’s first address on stage to her lord, a polite but vigorous imperative, reminds the audience that she is no ordinary slave. ‘The position of μὴ . . . is intended to be arresting’ (Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 677 μὴ φίλτατ’ ἀνδρῶν Οἰδίου τέκος γένη κτλ., comparing our passage and *OR* 1060–1 μὴ πρὸς θεῶν, εἶπερ τι τοῦ σαυτοῦ βίου | κήδη, ματεύσης τοῦθ’; add *Tr.* 436–7, [Demodocus] *A.P.* 11.238.5 = fr. 5.5 *IEG* μὴ, λίτομαι βασιλεῦ, μὴ τετράκις). The word order of her next address is similarly effective (371n.). She repeats δέσποτ’ Αἴας at 485 and 585, each time in an implicitly paraenetic context.

369 οὐκ ἐκτός; οὐκ ἄπορρον ἐκνεμῇ πόδα; ‘Get away! Take yourself off!’ Greek says ‘Will you not . . .’ in an abrupt command: cf. *OR* 430–1 οὐκ εἰς ὄλεθρον; οὐχὶ θάσσον αὖ [v.l. οὐ] πάλιν | ἄπορρος οἶκον τῶνδ’ ἀποστραφεῖς ἄπει;, *El.* 1430 ὦ παῖδες, οὐκ ἄπορρον;, Eur. *Or.* 1447 (as punctuated in Diggle’s apparatus), fr. 781.6 *TrGF* (with Kannicht’s apparatus). The idiomatic repetition of the negative tells against Neue’s proposal to delete the second οὐκ to give resposion with 384.

For ἐκτός in angry retort cf. *OR* 676 οὐκουν μ’ ἐάσεις κάκτος εἶ; (there too it means ‘away’ rather than specifically ‘outside’: M. Heath (1987) 178 n. 23). Epic ἄπορρος, absent from comedy and prose, occurs in tragedy at *El.* 53, 1430, *Tr.* 902, and [Aesch.] *PV* 1021. For similar expressions with πόδα cf. Eur. *Or.* 171, Ar. *Ran.* 478, Rau (1967) 117. The minority variant ἐκνεμῆς, also conjectured by Blaydes¹, is paralleled by fr. 269c.36 *TrGF* ἐπὶ με πόδα νέμει, Pind. *N.* 6.15 ἵχνεσιν ἐν Πραξιδάμαντος ἐὸν πόδα νέμων; but cf. *El.* 1384 for another unusual use by S. of a νέμω compound in the middle. ἐκνέμω elsewhere has a pastoral sense (Laroche (1949) 43).

371 ὦ πρὸς θεῶν ὕπεικε καὶ φρόνησον εὔ. ‘O by the gods, give way and come to your senses!’ Sophoclean protagonists are often urged to yield or be reasonable (Knox (1964) 16–17 and 13). For formulas of adjuration inserted between ὦ and the imperative see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 22; as at 368 (n.), word order conveys anxiety. Finglass (2009e) 89–92 discusses why this line is

spoken by Tecmessa (thus K^{ac}, *coni.* Hermann³), not the chorus (thus other manuscripts).

372–3 ὦ δύσμορος, δὲ χειρὶ μὲν | μεθῆκα τοὺς ἀλάστορας ‘O, wretch that I am, who let the accursed ones slip from my hand’. For the nominative of exclamation cf. 903, S–D II 65–6, Headlam on Herodas 5.55, Page on Eur. *Med.* 61. Here and at 387 Triclinius has ἰώ, presumably a metrical emendation; for the reverse change with the same motive see 901–2n. ἰώ may also be found here (but not at 387) in Q^{ac}, which would be an instance of a common corruption (cf. 419a, 609/10, *900, *901, *903, *908/9, *946, 1197, *El.* 121, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 209), especially when followed by μοι (as in the asterisked instances; cf. Diggle *ap.* Willink’s addenda to Eur. *Or.* 1465 and (1990) 122 = (1994) 397). For the idea ‘let slip from the hand’ cf. *OC* 904–6 τοῦτον δ’ ἐγὼ | . . . | ἄπρωτον οὐ μεθῆκ’ ἂν ἐξ ἐμῆς χειρός, 838–9 μέθες χεροῖν | τὴν παῖδα θάσσον. The noun ἀλάστωρ first appears here as a generalised term of abuse (cf. Dem. 18.296, 19.305, Men. *Perik.* 986); for the development of its senses see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1501.

The paradosis in the strophe gives ————, in the antistrophe ————. Two approaches restore responsion; I adopt the former. (i) Hermann (1796) 440 prints χερί for χερσί in the strophe; West on Hes. *Th.* 174 illustrates the corruption. For the dative with μεθῆκα cf. Emped. D–K 31 B 100.20 (I 349.1) εἰσόκε χειρὶ μεθῆ (Jebb’s claim, after Campbell, that ‘χερὶ belongs in sense to ἔδευσα no less than to μεθῆκα’, gives harsh hyperbaton); for the singular replacing a plural see 310n. Desire for the regular plural may have motivated the corruption. This change lets us keep προπάτωρ in the antistrophe (some editors prefer –τωρ, but the vocative noun demands a vocative adjective: 641/2n.). For προπάτωρ of the founder of a family M. Curti *ap.* Ferrari *et al.* (1992) 399 cites Eur. *Or.* 1441, Pind. *N.* 4.89, Hdt. 2.161.2; add Dioscorides *A.P.* 7.430.9 = 1665 *HE* πρόπατορ [Meineke: –τερ cod.] Ζεῦ, Risch (1949) 270–1 = (1981) 16.

(ii) Alternatively, we can print χεροῖν for χερσί μὲν in the strophe and πάτερ for προπάτωρ in the antistrophe. Triclinius reads χεροῖν, presumably a metrical emendation; he makes the same change at 618, a certain correction. Triclinius also deletes μὲν, which would be an easy interpolation before δέ in 374. πάτερ is again only in Triclinius’s text, where his scholia tell us ὡς καὶ ἐν τινι τῶν βιβλίων εὑρηται (p. 10.15–17 Tessier), a claim which we have no reason to deny (636/7–637/8n.). The reading may thus possibly reflect ancient tradition, but is more likely a slip than a unique preservation of the truth. (Dawe, *STS* I 140, finds it significant that Triclinius does not specify, as he often does, that the book is old; but even supposing that the omission is deliberate, we should not rely on his codicological expertise.) For the corruption (prompted by preceding προγόνων) see Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 22.8.

Both alternatives yield acceptable metre (see (11) in the metrical analysis above); both involve plausible corruptions. But the former involves a single change, the latter three (and in both strophe and antistrophe). Ll-J/W (*Sa.*) object that προπάτορ ‘surely makes the relationship too remote’ (in other words, Zeus was only Ajax’s great-grandfather and so could not be the ‘fore-father of his ancestors’), but Curti (*loc. cit.*) rightly points out that this objection is literal-minded. He notes that πρόγονοι in the plural is certain, yet the only πρόγονος in question was Aeacus (unless we include Ajax’s own father in that category).

374–6 ἐν δ’ ἔλικεσσι βουσί καὶ κλυτοῖς πεσών αἰπολίοις | ἔρεμνὸν αἶμ’ ἔδευσα.
 ‘and fell on the twisted-horned cattle and flocks of bleating goats and spilled their black blood.’ The epic timbre of these expressions (set out below) contrasts with the degrading action which they describe. ἔλικεσσι βουσί is an epic formula, though unattested elsewhere in the dative (Homer has ἔλικας βοῦς ten times, ἔλικες βόες once). The adjective was taken in antiquity as a reference to twisted horns or shambling gait (see S. West on *Od.* 1.92); the author of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* understood the former (191–2 βοῦς . . . πᾶσας κεράεσσιν ἔλικτάς). The double sigma in the dative ending –εσσι occurs several times in tragic lyric (see Diggle (1974) 22–3 n. 2 = (1994) 117–18 n. 81, (1981a) 2 with n. 1); to an Athenian audience it would probably have had an epic resonance, especially in this context.

κλυτοῖς . . . αἰπολίοις is a variation on Hom. *Od.* 9.308 κλυτὰ μῆλα, an expression not attested elsewhere. The sense of κλυτός here is proposed by a late scholium cited by Brunck (κλυτὰ λέγει τὰ αἰπόλια διὰ τὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς ταρχὰς καὶ φωνάς). West (2001b) 128–30 shows how the adjective often refers to sound in archaic and classical poetry (citing Ibycus fr. 303(b) *PMGF* ἄμος ἄυπνος κλυτὸς ὄρθρος ἐγείρῃσιν ἀηδόνας, and other examples from Simonides and Pindar; cf. also Hooker (1980) 144–6 = (1996) 479–81). He plausibly suggests that this sense fits both the above passages: in Homer the flocks are being milked, and twice in epic the act of milking is associated with animal noise (*Il.* 4.433–5, *Od.* 9.439), while the Sophoclean instance will have followed the Homeric. The senses ‘goodly’ (as advocated by Gow and Page on Philip *A.P.* 6.99.2 = 2728 *GP*) or ‘famous’ are weak and irrelevant; moreover, they fail to balance ἔλικεσσι, which refers to an obvious and perceptible quality of the animals. Lloyd-Jones translates ‘noble’, and Ll-J/W (*Sa.*) write ‘the Homeric epithet is . . . used here with bitter irony’; but the irony would be odd rather than bitter, and the sentence would be skewed if κλυτοῖς is ironic while ἔλικεσσι is not.

For ‘black blood’ cf. [918–19], 1412–13, Hom. *Il.* 13.655 = 21.119 ἐκ δ’ αἶμα μέλαν ῥέε, δεῦε δὲ γαῖαν and often in epic, Theogn. 349, Aesch. *Ag.* 1389–90 κάκφυσίων ὀξείαν αἵματος σφαγὴν | βάλλει μ’ ἔρεμνῃ ψακάδι φοινίας

δρόσου (the only other passage with ἑρεμνός), *S. Phil.* 824–5 μέλαινά τ' ἄκρου τις παρήρρωγεν ποδός | αἰμορραγῆς φλέψ, *Eur. El.* 318–19, *Ap. Rh.* 4.472–3, *Theocr.* 2.13, Padel (1992) 68 n. 66. δέω is usually ‘wet, dampen’; only here does the liquid in question accompany it in the accusative rather than the dative. The same occurs with τέγγω at *Ti.* 847–8 ἥ που ἄδινῶν χλωρὰν | τέγγει δακρύων ἄχναν and *Pind. N.* 10.75 θερμὰ δὴ τέγγων δάκρυα. Of two other possible instances, *OR* 1278–9 μέλας | ὄμβρος χαλάζης αἵματος ἐτέγγετο is corrupt, perhaps interpolated; while at *Eur. IT* 159–61 χοῶς . . . ὕδραίνειν should be emended to ὕγ– (see Diggle (1976a) 42, (1981d) = (1994) 148–9, 216–18).

377–8 τί δῆτ' ἂν ἀλγοίης ἐπ' ἐξειργασμένοις; | οὐ γὰρ γένοιτ' ἂν ταῦθ' ὅπως οὐχ ᾧδ' ἔχοι. ‘Why, then, should you grieve over what is accomplished? It is impossible that these things should not be as they are.’ For the attempted consolation cf. *Ti.* 742–3 τὸ γὰρ | φανθὲν τίς ἂν δύναιτ' <ἂν> ἀγένητον ποεῖν; , *Agathon TrGF* 39 f 5 μόνου γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ θεὸς στερίσκεται, | ἀγένητα ποιεῖν ἄσσο' ἂν ἥ πεπραγμένα, *Simon. fr.* 311 *Poltera* τὸ γὰρ γεγενημένον οὐκέτ' ἄρεκτον ἔσται with P's n., p. 245, *Pind. O.* 2.15–17, *Hor. C.* 3.29.46–7 (with Nisbet and Rudd), *Kassel* (1958) 91 §17, 237, *Cantarella* (1965) 267 n. 5 = (1970) 322 n. 5.

For δῆτα in questions see 42n. For examples of the formula ἐπ' ἐξειργασμένοις in verse and Herodotus see Fraenkel on *Aesch. Ag.* 1379; the preverb emphasises completion. ἔχοι for transmitted ἔχειν is owed to Herwerden (1886) 60; the scholium (p. 104 Chr.) ὅπως ταῦτα μὴ οὕτως σχοίη may show a trace of this reading. For the optative cf. *Aesch. Ag.* 620 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαιμι, *Eur. Alc.* 52 ἔστω οὖν ὅπως Ἀλκηστis ἐς γῆρας μόλοι; , Goodwin §241, K–G II 429. M. Curti *ap. Ferrari et al.* (1992) 394 objects that in these expressions the optative refers to the future, but so does our statement (cf. Jebb's ‘These things can never be but as they are’): the chorus rules out any change to the fact that Ajax perpetrated these actions. Demetrius Chalcondylas prints ἔχει (in his unpaginated edition of the *Suda* s.v. τί δῆτα; cf. ἔχη C^{ipc}, *coni.* Valckenaer (pre-1775)), but the indicative is doubtful after οὐ . . . γένοιτ' ἂν.

Supporting the paradoxos, Jebb claims that the construction combines οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο οὐχ ᾧδ' ἔχειν and οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο ὅπως τοῦτο οὐχ ᾧδ' ἔξει; the desperation this involves is brought out by his additional comment ‘in other words, the constr<uction> would be plain if ὅπως were struck out’. The alleged parallels cited by Curti (*loc. cit.*, citing K–G II 377 Anm. 7) from Xenophon are rightly dismissed by Ll-J/W (*ST*) as no guide to Attic usage; while other passages he refers to involve ὥς or ὥστε (cf. *OC* 385–6, K–G II 357–8), words which introduce an infinitive in a variety of situations, and thus not comparable to ὅπως.

379–93 After lamenting his misfortune, Ajax turns to the man whom he blames for it. The expression of his hatred intensifies as he moves from imagining his joy at Ajax’s troubles, to wishing that he could see him suffer, to praying that he could kill both him and the Atridae. The ‘barrage of abuse . . . [and] build up of opprobrious epithets’ (Mossman (1995) 75) is paralleled by Eur. *Hec.* 131–3 (cited 150–1n.).

379–80 ἰὼ πάνθ’ ὄρων, ἀπάντων τ’ αἰ | κακῶν ὄργανον, τέκνον Λαρτίου ‘*Io*, you who see all things, perpetual instrument of all evils, son of Laertes’. The emphasis on Odysseus’ power of sight is comparable to Philoctetes’ account of him at *Phil.* 1013–14 ἀλλ’ ἢ κακὴ σὴ διὰ μυχῶν βλέπουσ’ αἰ | ψυχὴ κτλ. Reinterpreting the paradosis to give πᾶν θ’ ὄρων (as Elmsley (1814) 359 does) gives inferior balance with ἀπάντων. The objection that ‘seeing everything’ was usually predicated of divine omnipotence (*El.* 659n.) led to support for the emendation πᾶντα δρῶν (*coni.* Valckenaer *teste* Burges on Aesch. *Eum.* 995). But the stress on Odysseus’ power of perception leads into 382: Ajax imagines that Odysseus is laughing because he sees his disgrace. Moreover, the immediate and prominent repetition of the word ‘all things’ in an expression denoting evil action colours the sense of the expression which precedes it, excluding a divine referent. For παν– in criticism of Odysseus cf. 445, *Phil.* 633–4 ἀλλ’ ἔστ’ ἐκείνῳ πάντα λεκτά, πάντα δὲ | τολμητά, fr. 913 *TrGF* (cited next paragraph).

For quasi-adjectival αἰ cf. *OR* 905 τάν . . . σὺν ἀθάνατον αἰὲν ἄρχάν. For κακῶν ὄργανον cf. fr. 913 *TrGF* πάνσοφον κρότημα, Λαέρτου γόνος (‘most ingenious tool’: Long (1968) 116), [Eur.] *Rhes.* 498–9 ἔστι δ’ αἰμυλώτατον | κρότημ’ Ὀδυσσεύς, *Phil.* 927–8 (Philoctetes on Neoptolemus) πανουργίας | δεινῆς τέχνημ’ ἔχθιστον. The name Λαρτίου is only in Triclinius’s text (probably as a metrical emendation) and R (more likely just an error), while most manuscripts have Λαερτίου; for the different forms see 1–2n., 1393–5n.

The minority reading ἀπάντων τ’ αἰών led Ll-J/W to conjecture ἅπαντ’ αἰών, which would place further emphasis on the powers of perception so appropriate in a master schemer. But this variant is limited to five manuscripts, none pre-Palaeologan, four of which also carry the paradosis; this suggests corruption rather than preservation of the truth. Moreover, corruption from αἰ to αἰών is straightforward, since the former is surrounded by three words all ending –ων, one of which is a participle with a meaning parallel to αἰών (cf. M. Curti *ap. Ferrari et al.* (1992) 397–8). Reminiscence of *OC* 1767 χῶ πάντ’ αἰών Διὸς Ὀρκος could have assisted the mistake. The reverse error, which additionally posits the change of ἅπαντ’ to ἀπάντων τ’, is harder to explain. (Ll-J/W argue in *ST* that ‘you who see all things and hear all things’ is easier than the paradosis to predicate of Odysseus because ‘it <is> clear that “all things” mean <s> “all things happening around him”’, whereas ‘you who see all things’ on its own sounds too much like a description of a divinity. But

(i) there is no reason to suppose, in either case, that ‘all things’ is limited to ‘all things around him’; (ii) even if there were, why should Ajax declare that Odysseus can ‘see and hear all things around him’?)

381 κακοπινέστατον τ’ ἄλῃμα στρατοῦ ‘the most vile and filthy trickster from the army’. κακοπιν– is not found elsewhere; πίνος and related words occur in tragedy at *OC* 1259, Aesch. *Ag.* 777, Eur. *El.* 184, 305, *Or.* 225. ἄλῃμα ‘should properly mean “that which is ground” [< ἄλέω], hence something fine, subtle and tricky’ (Long (1968) 115); cf. perhaps Ar. *Av.* 429–30 πυκνότατον κίναδος, | σόφισμα, κύρμα, τρῖμμα, παιπάλημ’ ὄλον (perhaps < παιπάλη ‘fine flour’: see Dunbar), Garulli (2007) 418–26), also from a description of Odysseus. The noun is repeated at 389 but not found elsewhere (the minority variant at *Ant.* 320 should be rejected). Collard (2005a) 370 cites other examples of nouns in –μα used in abusive personal descriptions.

382 ἦ που πολὺν γέλωθ’ ὕφ’ ἡδονῆς ἄγεις. ‘I suppose you laugh long and loud in your delight!’ For the distress caused by the laughter of enemies see 367n. For γέλως and ἡδονή combined cf. Homeric ἡδὺ γελᾶν at e.g. *Il.* 23.784, Antiphanes fr. 142.8–10 *PCG* with Zuntz (1960) 38 = (1972) 85 (‘it expresses the delight over . . . some happening . . . which most often consists in some harm or suffering undergone by others’). For ἦ που see 176n. For ὑπό of attendant circumstances see 257–8n. ἄγω γέλωτα ‘denotes frequent or continued derision’ (Jebb, comparing Eur. *Or.* 183 κτύπον ἀγάγετ’; cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. ἄγω A IV 3). The minority variant ἔχεις (*coni.* Herwerden (1868) 12; for the confusion see 62–4n.) removes this nuance. γέλωθ’ is better attested than the variant γέλων, and its elision prevents a bisected iambic trimeter (thus Elmsley (1813b) 429); both accusatives are metrically guaranteed in this play (303, 958).

383 ξὺν τῷ θεῷ πᾶς καὶ γελᾷ κώδύρεται. ‘As the god determines, so every man laughs and cries.’ ξὺν τῷ θεῷ refers to divinity in general (cf. Eur. fr. 490.1 *TrGF*, Xen. *Hipp.* 5.14). Schneidewin (1849) 460 advocates replacing τῷ (cf. *OR* 146, Eur. fr. 490.1 *TrGF*) with τοι, a particle found in many gnomic utterances (Denniston 542–3); for the position of τοι between preposition and noun see 268n. There is little to choose between the alternatives.

384–5 ἴδοιμι <δῆ> νιν, καίπερ ὦδ’ ἀτῶμενος— | ἰὼ μοί μοι. ‘If only I could see him, ruined though I am – *Io moi moi.*’ The aposiopesis is recognised by Kamerbeek and Fraenkel (1957) 29 n. 1. The syntax may be complete, but the sense is not: as he moves from one attack on Odysseus to another, Ajax can hardly pray simply to see his enemy, but rather must want to see him suffer. For such a wish by people who are themselves suffering (καίπερ ὦδ’ ἀτῶμενος) cf. *Phil.* 1043–4 ὡς ζῶ μὲν οἰκτρῶς, εἰ δ’ ἴδοιμ’ ὀλωλότας | τούτους, δοκοῖμ’ ἂν τῆς νόσου πεφευγέναι, 1113–15 ἴδοίμαν δέ νιν, | τὸν τᾶδε μῆσάμενον,

τὸν ἴσον χρόνον | ἑμᾶς λαχόντ’ ἀνίας, *Tr.* 1034/5–1038/40, *Men. Mis.* fr. 7.1–2 Sandbach, Headlam on Herodas 3.97, Fraenkel (cited above), Collard (2005a) 371. The idiom is pointed, since Odysseus has just been described as πάνθ’ ὀρώω (379). In the wider context there is an irony, in that Odysseus has recently refused to take pleasure in the spectacle of Ajax’s humiliation. If we are determined to avoid aposiopesis, something like Ll-J/W’s ἐλοιμι would be necessary; but an outright wish to kill Odysseus would remove the idiomatic emphasis on sight, and disrupt the crescendo of imprecation (379–93n.).

δὴ is only in Triclinius, presumably as a metrical emendation to effect responsion with 369. For δὴ in wishes Denniston 218 compares Alcman fr. 26.2 *PMGF* βάλε δὴ βάλε κηρύλος εἶην, *Ar. Plut.* 891–2. Other possibilities (in descending order of probability) include ἐγώ (so Elmsley (1814) 359, comparing Aesch. *Cho.* 267–8 οὐς ἴδοιμ’ ἐγὼ ποτε | θανόντας ἐν κηκίδι πισσῆρει φλογός; cf. also Eur. *Med.* 163–5), τοι (Hermann¹), μὴν (L. Dindorf *teste* Morstadt (1864) 43, approved by Jebb on the ground that it affords ‘a light adversative force’, but this is rare in drama: see Denniston 334–5), and νυν (*coni.* Apitz on *Tr.* 983, then in his edition, and regarded as next best by Jebb: but an inferential sense is inappropriate, while temporal νυν with a short upsilon is not attested for S. (cf. Finglass (2007b)). If we do not supplement, we must remove a syllable from 369; but this is unlikely (n.). For ἀτώμενος see 269n.

386 μηδὲν μέγ’ εἶπης: ‘Speak no proud word!’ For the prohibition against arrogance or blasphemy see Finglass (2005b) 630–1 with n. 8, *El.* 830 μηδὲν μέγ’ αὐσης with n. Ajax explicitly defies the prohibition at 422–3. Cf. μέγα φρονεῖν at 1088, 1120 (οὐ μικρόν), 1125; also perhaps τοσόσδε (770n.).

οὐχ ὀρᾷς ἴν’ εἴ κακοῦ; ‘Do you not see what stage of misery you have reached?’ (Lloyd-Jones). For the partitive genitive see *El.* 935–6 οὐκ εἰδυῖ’ ἄρα | ἴν’ ἤμεν ἄτης (n.).

387 ὦ Ζεῦ προγόνων προπάτορ ‘O Zeus, forefather of my ancestors’. The earliest text to assert Ajax’s descent from Zeus is Alcaeus fr. 387 Voigt Κρονίδα βασιλῆος γένος Αἴαν τὸν ἄριστον πεδ’ Ἀχιλλεα. In the second half of the sixth century, at least in Aegina, Ajax’s father Telamon was established as a son of Aeacus, the son of Zeus (644–5n.). In the *Iliad*, as here, Ζεῦ πάτερ opens speeches ‘in which the speaker reacts to a negative circumstance by implicitly or explicitly requesting Zeus’ aid’ (Kelly (2007) 247); in tragedy it is found in requests for assistance more generally (cf. *OR* 201/2, Aesch. *Sept.* 116, *Cho.* 783–4). Ajax’s cry is still more impassioned, because Zeus is one of his recent progenitors; his abandonment thus seems more terrible. For Triclinius’s ἰώ, and the choice of προπάτορ over προπάτωρ or πάτερ, see 372–3n.

388–91 πῶς ἂν τὸν αἰμυλώτατον, | ἐχθρόν ἄλημα, τοὺς τε δισσάρχας ὀλέσσας βασιλῆς, | τέλος θάνοιμι καὐτός; ‘If only I could destroy that

arch-deceiver, that evil trickster, and the twin chieftains, and then finally die myself!’ Ajax’s wish is expressed in the familiar form ‘when I have gained my object let me die content’, for which cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 438 ἐπειτ’ ἐγὼ νοσφίσας ὀλοίμην [Turnebus e Σ: ἐλ– cod.] with Sier. But in the instances which they cite the proposed action (which often involves killing) lies in the future, as a dangerous but still longed-for prospect. Ajax has just attempted to effect his wish, and this lends his words frustration and bitterness. Moreover, although Ajax uses a form in which the prospective death of the speaker is merely conventional, in his case he is already fixed on death (cf. 361). Indeed, his failure to kill the people whom he wishes dead leads directly to his own destruction.

For πῶς ἄν with the optative as ‘a primarily tragic idiom . . . highly emotional and express[ing] a hopeless wish’ see A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 22–4, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 792. A similar form (with τίς for πῶς) is used at 879/80–887/8. αἰμύλος is a recurring epithet for Odysseus: cf. Eur. fr. 715.1 *TrGF* οὐκ ἄρ’ Ὀδυσσεύς ἐστιν αἰμύλος μόνος, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 498–9 αἰμυλώτατον | κρότημ’ Ὀδυσσεύς, 709, Tr. Adesp. fr. 564d *TrGF* ὦ πλεῖον ἥϊλωσ’ αἰμύλης ἀλώπεκος (if, as Maas (1934) 165 conjectures, this refers to Odysseus). The former *Rhesus* passage, where the adjective is accompanied by a neuter in –μα, may be influenced by our own (cf. ἄλημα, on which see 381n.).

δισσάρχης (*hapax*) may be coined on μόναρχος (251/2–253/4n.). –άρχης sounded poetic in Attic (Rüedi (1969) 111–23); Attic inscriptions show –αρχος into Roman times, with the exception of μεράρχαι (*IG* II–III² 1203.7, 324/3 BC). Triclinius’s ὀλέσσας is presumably a metrical emendation for transmitted ὀλέσας. For the epic aorist with a double sigma in tragic lyric, and for the corruption into the more usual form, see Diggle (1981a) 49; for the epic double sigma elsewhere in the play see 183–5n. For the orthography βασιλῆς see 188–90n.

392–3 ὅταν κατεύχη ταῦθ’, ὁμοῦ κάμοι θανεῖν | εὐχου· τί γὰρ δεῖ ζῆν με σοῦ τεθνηκός; ‘When you pray for that, pray at the same time for death for me too. For why should I live when you are dead?’ For the expression see Bond on Eur. *Her.* 1301 τί δῆτά με ζῆν δεῖ; and cf. the idea ‘you have killed me by your death’ found in contexts of mourning (*El.* 808n.). Repetition of compound verb by simplex is an Indo-European phenomenon found in a range of classical genres in Greek and Latin: cf. perhaps 1074, 1084, *OR* 1076, Watkins (1967), Diggle (1973) 265 with n. 64 = (1994) 84 with n. 64, Adams (1992), Wills (1996) 319–20, 349, 438–43, and (for the reverse phenomenon) *El.* 923n. Related, though distinct, is the anadiplosis of compound followed by simplex verb in Euripides (cf. Diggle (1990) 117 = (1994) 389–90). κάμοι goes with εὐχου, not ὁμοῦ (cf. Corlu (1966) 100 n. 1).

394a–395 ἰὼ | σκότος, ἐμὸν φάος, | Ἔρεβος ὦ φαεννότατον, ὥς ἐμοὶ Ἰο darkness, my light, ο Erebus, most bright for me’. Ajax expresses his alienation

from conventional values (cf. Instone (2007) 230–3) using imagery previously employed by Athena when interfering with his vision (cf. 85). σκότος and φάος are regularly opposed: cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 222–3, *Cho.* 62–3, 319 σκότῳ φάος ἀντίμοιρον [Erfurdt: ἰσοτιμοιρον cod.], fr. 6.4 *TrGF* πάλιν γὰρ ἴκουσ' ἐκ σκότου τόδ' εἰς φάος, perhaps Eur. *Her.* 641 (*coni.*: see Bond), Pind. fr. 108b S–M, Lyr. Adesp. fr. 1019.8 *PMG*, Xen. *Cyr.* 4.2.26, Call. *A.P.* 7.317.1 = 1269 *HE*. Erebus is regularly ‘the region of darkness as opposed to the realm of light’ (West on Hes. *Th.* 123, where add Alcaeus *A.P.* 7.429.10 = 105 *HE*), while darkness and the Underworld are commonly associated (cf. 660, Theogn. 1014 εἰς Αἴδου δῶμα μέλαν, Kroll (1932) index s.v. ‘Finsternis’, West (1997) 159–60, (2007) 388). Ajax’s paradoxical conflation of these opposites signals his rejection of conventional values, as well as his desire for death. Contrast the prayer of the Homeric Ajax at *Il.* 17.645–7, when he asks for light in place of the mist which enshrouds the fighting. His ironic imperative ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλυσσον, associating light with death rather than rescue (*El.* 1224n.), may have influenced the present passage.

The equation is repeated for emphasis, with effective variation and intensification in the second occurrence. Generalised ‘darkness’ yields to the more ominous Erebus, the Underworld; the two nouns are accompanied by ἰώ and ὤ, the latter following rather than preceding its noun. σκότος is in apposition with another noun qualified by the first person possessive pronoun; ἔρεβος is qualified by a superlative adjective, and followed by a first person personal pronoun. The combination of balance and variety, together with the simple grandeur of the sentiment, makes this one of S.’s most memorable phrases.

Willink (2002) 55–6 = (2010) 389–90 deletes ἰώ here instead of inserting it at 412, but the address to the abstract σκότος requires an introductory cry. φαεννότατον shows the usual tragic form of the adjective (cf. [856]), taken from lyric (cf. Sappho fr. 34.2 Voigt φάεννον [Scaliger: φαεινόν codd.], Pind. *O.* 1.6); correct Attic is φανός (in tragedy only at [Aesch.] *PV* 538). For ὥς ἔμοι marking the perspective of the speaker cf. *Ant.* 1161 Κρέων γὰρ ἦν ζηλωτός, ὥς ἔμοι, ποτέ, *OC* 75–6 εἰ | γενναῖος, ὥς ἰδόντι; the effect is limitative (Moorhouse 85, 305, Headlam on Aesch. *Ag.* 618ff.; cf. 537), suggesting the uniqueness of Ajax’s perspective.

396–397/8 ἔλυσθ' ἔλυσθέ μ' οἰκήτορα, | ἔλυσθέ μ' ‘take, take me as your inhabitant, take me!’ Ajax’s wish for death is expressed in its most magnificent form, emphasised by the climactic repetition: cf. *Ti.* 1005a–1005c ἔἄτ' μ' ἔἄτ' με | δύσμορον εὐνᾶσθαι, | ἔἄτ' με δύστανον, *Phil.* 816, Aesch. *Eum.* 996–7 <χαίρετε, > χαίρετ' ἑναισιμίαισ<1> πλούτου, | χαίρετ' Ἀττικὸς λεώς, Fehling (1969) 178. Predictably, each occurrence of the verb appears as either ἔλυσθ' or ἔλυσθέ μ' in at least some manuscripts; but the great majority have a mu in all

three places, and only Triclinius omits it in the first instance, presumably as a metrical emendation. Elmsley first prints the (metrically guaranteed) correct pattern (1805/6 ed.).

For οικήτορα of an inhabitant of the Underworld cf. *Tr.* 1161 Ἰδου φθίμενος οικήτωρ, *Tr.* Adesp. fr. 660/1.7 *TrGF* Πλοῦτωνος οικήτω[ρ, and (in the plural) 517, *Tr.* 282 Ἰδου . . . οικήτορες.

397/8–399/400 οὔτε γὰρ θεῶν γένος | οὔθ' ἀμερίων ἔτ' ἄξιος | βλέπειν τιν' εἰς ὄνησιν ἀνθρώπων. 'For I am no longer fit to look to the race of gods or mortal men for any help.' Desperation is similarly characterised at *OC* 828–9 οἶμοι τάλαινα, ποῖ φύγω; ποῖαν λάβω | θεῶν ἄρηξιν ἢ βροτῶν;, *Polyb.* 15.1.13–14, *Cic. Ver.* 4.101, *Tac. Hist.* 5.3. βλέπω governs both the accusative γένος (twice, since it is understood with ἀμερίων) and the prepositional phrase τιν' εἰς ὄνησιν (cf. Σ p. 108 Chr., Kiefner (1964) 69–70). Another possibility (noted by MDR) is to take θεῶν γένος and ἀμερίων . . . τιν' (partitive genitive) as objects of βλέπειν, although that involves more complex word order. Lobeck construes οὔτε εἰς θεῶν γένος οὔτε εἰς τιν' ὄνησιν ἀνθρώπων ἡμερίων βλέπειν ἄξιός εἰμι. But it is easier to understand γένος before ἀμερίων than εἰς before θεῶν (in alleged parallels for the latter construction, such as *El.* 780 οὔτε νυκτὸς ὕπνον οὔτ' ἐξ ἡμέρας (n.), the place where a preposition must be understood is closer to the preposition).

For the antithesis of γένη of men and gods cf. *Hom. Il.* 6.180 ἦ δ' ἄρ' ἔην θεῖον γένος, οὔδ' ἀνθρώπων, West (2007) 126 with n. 21; periphrasis with γένος is usually high register (examples in A/O on *Ar. Thesm.* 46–8). For gods opposed to ἀμέριοι ἀνθρώποι cf. *Ant.* 787/8–790 καὶ σ' οὔτ' ἀθανάτων φύξιμος οὔδεις | οὔθ' ἀμερίων σέ γ' [Nauck: ἐπ' codd.] ἀνθρώπων. For the aspiration and vocalism of ἀμέριος see 208–9n. ὄνησιν shows the correct vocalism (cf. Björck (1950) 170 n. 1, 237); Livineius's ὄνασιν can be rejected.

401a–402 ἀλλά μ' Ἄ Διὸς | ἀλκίμα θεὸς | †δoléθριον† ἄκίζει. 'But the mighty goddess, daughter of Zeus, torments me †to my destruction†.' As at 450–3, Ajax does not hesitate to assert Athena's involvement; members of the audience who speculated on how he knew this would conclude that he has extrapolated from his exchange with the goddess in the prologue (now he knows that she was taunting him), or that he is generally familiar with Athena's support for Odysseus (14n.). R. Parker (1999) 17 with n. 19 contrasts the vaguer language used by Tecmessa, the chorus, and Menelaus (172–86, 243–4, 278–9, 1057, 1128), who do not communicate directly with the gods and are more circumspect in attributing actions to named deities.

For the genitive Διὸς denoting paternity see 172–5n. Triclinius's γ' after this word provides a long syllable for respiration, but the colometry adopted here makes that unnecessary; the particle is also semantically out of place here. For ἄλκιμος of Athena cf. *Tr.* Adesp. fr. 81.1 *TrGF*.

Metre reveals δᾰλῆθριον as corrupt (see the metrical analysis at (25)). (According to West (1979b) 115, ‘the rare personal sense [of δᾰλῆθριος], “belonging to death”, is especially Sophoclean’, which might be taken to support the paradosis, but, of his examples, *Tr.* 878 τᾰλαιν’ δᾰλῆθρίᾰ looks odd and is probably to be emended (see Ll-J/W, *Sa.*); *OR* 1342/3 δᾰλῆθριον μέγαν is unmetrical, and while most editors adopt Erfurdt’s μέγ’ δᾰλῆθριον, Bergk’s δᾰλεθρόν με γᾰς is also attractive; and *OC* 1683–4 νῶν δ’ δᾰλῆθρίᾰ | νύξ ἐπ’ δᾰμμασιν βέβᾰκε only provides an instance if we accept Hartung’s δᾰλῆθρίαιν, which is not compelling.) There are two plausible emendations. δᾰλῆθρί (*coni.* Dindorf (1836) 300) gives a neuter plural adjective used adverbially (197–8n.) at virtually no palaeographical cost; while οὔλιον (*coni.* Wunder (1841) 89) yields a word frequently glossed with δᾰλῆθριος (as in our play in several manuscripts at Σ 933 = p. 206 Chr.; also Hesych. ο 1742 (cf. 1747) = π 793 Latte οὔλιᾰ δᾰλῆθρίᾰ, *Suda* ο 905 = π 586.27–8 Adler and cf. 28n.). οὔλιος is attested for tragedy only at 933, but ὀλοός is also found, and in the passive sense required here (*Tr.* 846, Aesch. *Pers.* 962; cf. Schuurisma (1932) 50); so is οὔλόμενος and οὔλόφρων (*coni.*: FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 750). (Wunder suggests the same corruption at *Tr.* 845, where the transmitted responson of ~~~ to — in the base of a glyconic is remarkable: cf. Itsumi (1984) 68.) The text offered by the *Lexicon Vindobonense* ἄλλᾰ με κήδει Διὸς ἀλκίμα θυγάτηρ (κ 32 = p. 109.10–11 Nauck) led Bergk (1850) 562 n. * to conjecture δᾰλῆθριον κήδει, but active κήδω is not found in tragedy.

ᾰκίζει is owed to Willink (2002) 56 = (2010) 390–1 after West for manuscript αἰκ– (65n.).

403–4 ποῖ τις οὔν φύγη; | ποῖ μολῶν μὲνῶ; ‘So where should a man flee? Where should I go and take a stand?’ For such questions from those in dire straits see *El.* 812n. The deliberative subjunctive (S–D π 318) is accompanied by a question in the future (parallels in FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 777; hence we may reject μένω, *coni.* Blaydes¹). For the third person question where a first person might be expected cf. *OC* 170 θύγατερ, ποῖ τις φροντίδος ἔλθῃ;., Ar. *Plut.* 438 ποῖ τις φύγη;., A/O on *Thesm.* 603–4, Wackernagel (1926–8) 1 110–11 = (2009) 147–8; also 245/6–246/7n. The minority variant τράπη (for φύγη) probably arose from expressions like Ar. *Ran.* 296 ποῖ δῆτ’ ἂν τραποίμην;., *Thesm.* 603 ποῖ τις τρέφεται;

405a–408/9 εἰ τᾰ μὲν <~— | —> φθίνει, φίλοι, | τοῖσδ’ ὁμοῦ †πέλας†, | μῶραις δ’ ἄγραις προσκείμεθα, | πᾰς δῆ στρατὸς δίπαλτος ἂν με χειρὶ φονέοι. ‘If... is perishing together with these..., my friends, and I have devoted myself to a futile hunt, the whole army, brandishing spears in both hands, would kill me.’ The paradosis is deficient in sense and metre. (i) The referent of τᾰ in εἰ τᾰ μὲν φθίνει is obscure (thus Garvie). Translations include ‘omnis felicitas’ (Johnson), ‘ultionis spes’ (Brunck), ‘mon passé’ (Mazon), ‘alle denkbare Rettung’ (Schneidewin^{1–2}), ‘mein früherer Ruhm und die Ehre’

(Schneidewin³), but none has support in the text. In particular, Ajax would scarcely refer to his past glory so allusively. (ii) The pleonasm τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ πέλας is hard to explain. The phrase would have to mean 'together with these, nearby' (with ὁμοῦ governing the dative and πέλας used absolutely), but this is strained and flat. 'These' presumably refers to the animals, and while in performance a gesture could have made this clear, a noun would help, especially as they have not been mentioned since 374–6. (iii) According to the most plausible colometry of 423–4, three syllables are missing somewhere in 405a–405b; Reiske (1753–69) first identifies the presence of a lacuna.

Problems (i) and (iii) are probably connected: words have dropped out which describe something perishing together with the animals. The most obvious supplement would involve a reference to Ajax's reputation, or his glorious deeds (cf. 618–620/1): there is a close connexion between Ajax's disgrace and the death of the animals (cf. 305–10, 323–6, 450–5). As for (ii), πέλας could be a gloss on ὁμοῦ which has intruded into the text (Hermann³; cf. 28n.); the displaced word would thus not need to be palaeographically similar, and could have designated the slain animals. Supplementing on this basis could give something like εἰ τὸ μὲν κλέος | νῦν φθίνει, φίλοι, | τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ βοτοῖς [κλέος Nauck⁴ p. 182; βοτοῖς Jebb]. This *exempli gratia* restoration involves changing τὰ to τό, but in the midst of so much corruption this is the least of our problems. Corruption may lie deeper. μὲν could have been interpolated under the influence of δ' in 407, which would free more space for a suitable phrase. φίλοι too could be an addition; Leo (1908) 10–11 with 11 n. 1 points out that it is unexpected for Ajax to address the chorus at this point, since after his opening vocatives he has now moved on to other addressees.

The position of the lacuna is owed to Hermann³; other possibilities include after τὰ (*ibid.*) or φθίνει (Palmer). But the former delays μὲν and splits the lacuna in two, making it harder to fill, while the latter puts the verb in an uncomfortable position between article and noun (as with τὰ μὲν φθίνει | ἔργα μου, supplemented by Mueller (1878) 15). Stinton (1977a) 127–8 = (1990) 272–3 deletes πέλας and places the whole supplement after ὁμοῦ (giving τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ <φόνοις | θηρῶν>, φίλοι), but this is based on an inferior colometry and fails to supply anything with τὰ μὲν.

A slightly different text in the antistrophe would reduce the number of 'missing' syllables here: by reading μέγ' (not μέγα) and Τροία (not Τρωία) the deficit is only one, not three. But the resulting metre, — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — | ◡ — ◡ — etc. is odd, and requires emendation of the otherwise blameless τοῖσδ' to give a word of scanning ◡ —. The most likely change would be Erfurdt's τοιοῖσδ' (cf. 453); Lobeck² tries τίσις δ', but 'it is dishonour, not vengeance, that Ajax dreads' (Stinton (1977a) 128 n. 8 = (1990) 272 n. 8).

The correct Attic accent on μῶραις (for which see Arcadius 69 = p. 79.12 Schmidt, Probert (2006) 75, 260 n. 7) is only in QRN (*coni.* Elmsley *teste*

Dindorf³); most manuscripts have $\mu\omega\rho\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$, the *Koine* form. The corruption occurs elsewhere in tragedy in the secondary tradition (cf. fr. 951.2, Eur. fr. 166.1, 193.2, 331.2, 392.2, 775a.1 *TrGF*).

For προσκείμεθα see *El.* 240–1n., Headlam on Herodas 5.3, and cf. ἔγκειμαι at *Phil.* 1318, Diggle (1981b) 95 = (1994) 212.

δή for δέ is owed to Stinton (1977a) 129 = (1990) 273; for the confusion see Pind. *P.* 11.25n. δέ would have to be either apodotic after a protasis, which would be confusing after the preceding δέ clause with a different syntactic function (contrast the two Sophoclean examples cited by Denniston 181, *OR* 302 and *Ant.* 234); or the continuation of a gargantuan protasis taking up the whole of 405a–408/9, which would weigh down the otherwise nimble question in 404 by forcing it to become in effect the apodosis of the entire sense unit. The change from indicatives in 405b and 407 to the optative in 408/9 also suggests that πᾶς . . . φονεύοι is not merely a third clause in parallel to the clauses in 405a–407. Stinton also emends ἄν to ὦν on the ground of word order (‘ἄν is misplaced’) and sense (‘Ajax *wants* to die’, comparing 361, 394a–397/8). But με immediately after ἄν suggests an idiomatic gathering of unstressed words after a host word; while a wish for death would be out of place in this context, which rather demands a description of Ajax’s peril to justify his questions in 403–4.

The translation of δίπαλτος is owed to Pius fr. 16 Hiller (143–5n.). Brandishing a pair of spears was a feature of Homeric warfare: cf. *Il.* 3.[18–19] δοῦρε δύω . . . | πάλλων [*del.* Zenodotus, Aristarchus, West; but the lines could have been in S.’s text of Homer], 5.495 = 6.104 = 11.212 πάλλων δ’ ὄξεα δοῦρα, 12.298 δύο δοῦρε τινάσσων and (for the Homeric model in later literature) Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 643, Pind. *P.* 4.79 (Braswell rightly rejects Fraenkel’s denial of Homeric influence on this passage), Bacchyl. 18.49, Eur. *Hec.* 1155–6 (with Diggle’s apparatus). On vase paintings from the second half of the eighth century a warrior standardly has two spears; this is also common in vase paintings from the seventh century, although there the single spear is also found (Snodgrass (1964a) 136–9, Van Wees (1994) 138 with 152 n. 76). The adjective probably also has this sense in the description of Zeus’ thunderbolt at Eur. *Trö.* 1102–3 δίπαλτον ἱερὸν . . . κεραυνοφαῆς πῦρ; for the picture cf. the statue of Zeus Horkios at Olympia (before which competitors at the games swore to play fair), which had a thunderbolt in each hand (Paus. 5.24.9 ἔχει δὲ ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ κεραυνὸν χειρί, cited by Lorimer (1940) 176, who also (p. 180) compares Near Eastern depictions of gods similarly armed). Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 1361a–1361b διπύρους ἀνέχουσα | λαμπάδας ὀξύτατας χερσὶν (‘two torches, both blazing’ – Dover *ad loc.*). The only other classical occurrence of the adjective, Eur. *IT* 323 δίπαλτα πολεμίων ξίφη, gives a variation on this sense: the reference is still to two weapons brandished in separate hands, but because two individuals are in question, each has only one sword.

Didymus (p. 242 Schmidt) takes the word to mean παντὶ σθένει, but intensificatory δι- is unparalleled (so correctly Lorimer, p. 174); contrast Aesch. *Sept.* 985 τριπλάτων πημάτων ‘threefold [i.e. especially bitter] woes’, where intensifying τρι- is unexceptional (cf. Risch (1949) 275–6 = (1981) 92–3, (1976) 886–7 = (1981) 579–80, Thesleff (1954) 177, Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 309–14). Jebb interprets ‘wielding their swords with both hands’, but as Lorimer points out, the double-handed sword was unknown in ancient Greece. (Similarly for the *Troades* passage cited above: Zeus is never depicted holding a single thunderbolt in two hands, which would be a clumsy way of despatching the missile.)

410–11 ὦ δυστάλαινα, τοιάδ’ ἄνδρα χρήσιμον | φωνεῖν, ἃ πρόσθεν οὗτος οὐκ ἔτλη ποτ’ ἄν. ‘Unhappy woman, that an able man should say such things, which he never would have brought himself to before.’ For the thought cf. 317–18; for the expression cf. *Ti.* 158 (Heracles left me a message as he left) ἀμοὶ πρόσθεν οὐκ ἔτλη ποτέ (also a woman on the strange behaviour of her partner). The exclamatory accusative and infinitive conveys strong emotion (cf. A. Anderson (1914), especially 61, 74–5, S–D II 379–80, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1662–3, Watson on Hor. *Ia.* 8.1); the idiom is found in a variety of genres, but the absence of the definite article suggests a higher register (cf. Stevens (1976) 61). For ἄνδρα χρήσιμον cf. Hor. *C.* 1.12.42 *utilem bello* (‘the dry commendation suits military discourse’: Nisbet and Hubbard), Eur. *Phoen.* [1740] φεῦ τὸ χρήσιμον φρενῶν; contrast Hes. *Op.* 297 ἄχρηϊός ἀνήρ.

412a ἰώ, required for respension with 394a, is owed to Brunck. Most manuscripts omit it, but ὦ is found as a gloss in KHNv and in the text of **r**. This may be a corrupt trace of original ἰώ, although the reverse corruption is more common (372–3n.). More probably ἰώ dropped out, ὦ was added later as a gloss on the vocative, and the ancestor of **r** promoted the gloss to the text (28n.).

412b–413 πόροι ἀλὶρρόθοι | πάραλά τ’ ἄντρα καὶ νέμος ἐπάκτιον ‘surging straits of the sea, caves by the shore, and pasture of the coast’ (Lloyd-Jones, adapted). Ajax’s invocation moves steadily inland; cf. the Paedagogus’ description of the Argolid at *El.* 2–10 (n.), which begins with places furthest away and culminates in the building represented by the skene. Ajax’s suicide speech has a similar passage (859–63) at a moment of high emotion.

The opening phrase recurs at Aesch. *Pers.* 367 ἐκπλους φυλάσσειν καὶ πόρους ἀλὶρρόθους. The use of πόροι for the sea goes back to Homer (*Od.* 12.259 πόρους ἁλός, LSJ⁹ s.v. πόρος 1 3); ἀλὶρρόθος is found elsewhere only at Eur. *Hipp.* 1205 and Moschus 2.132 (cf. also –ρόθιος ‘sea-beaten’ at Ant. Sid. *A.P.* 7.6.4 = 227 *HE*). For caves by the shore cf. fr. 549 *TrGF* κρημνούς τε καὶ σήραγγας ἡδ’ ἐπακτίας | αὐλῶνας, Eur. *IT* 107 ἄντρ’ ἃ πόντος νοτίζει διακλύζει μέλας, 262–3 διαρρώξ κυμάτων πολλῶ σάλω | κοιλωπὸς ἀγμός.

414–415/16 πολλὺν πολλὺν με δαρὸν τε δὴ | κατεῖχετ' ἀμφὶ Τροίαν χρόνον· 'Long, long, long time have you held me at Troy.' The otherwise prosaic πολλὺν χρόνον receives emphasis and elevation from the repetition of πολλὺν, the insertion of the poetic δαρὸν, and the hyperbaton delaying χρόνον until the end. For δαρὸν . . . χρόνον (found in epic and tragedy) see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 516; for the alpha vocalism see Björck (1950) 126. For local ἀμφὶ with the accusative cf. 1064, Moorhouse 97.

416/17–417/18 ἀλλ' οὐκέτι μ', οὐκέτ' ἀμπνοάς | ἔχοντα 'but no more will you have me – no more with the breath of life' (Jebb, adapted). Instead of μ' Hermann¹ suggests γ', presumably because of με earlier in the sentence. But the repetition of the enclitic in such a long sentence is not a problem, while the sense of γ' would be unclear; if needed, the particle should rather go after ἀμπνοάς. For the apocope of the preverb in ἀμπνοάς see K–B 1 180, Jebb on *Ant.* 1275, Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 296–8, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 1048, adding *Tr.* 648, fr. 314.175, 422, 973 *TrGF*.

417/18 τοῦτό τις φρονῶν ἴστω. 'Let anyone in his senses know this' (Moorhouse 159). Collective τις is accompanied by a jussive verb, as at Hom. *Il.* 16.209; cf. also 965, *Ant.* 28, Eur. *Hclld.* 826–7, Pearson on fr. 593.4ff.

419a–420 ὦ Σκαμάνδριοι | γείτονες ῥοαὶ | εὐφρονες Ἀργείοις 'O neighbouring streams of the Scamander, well disposed to the Argives'. ὦ (only in Triclinius) will be a metrical emendation to give responsion with 401a. Other manuscripts have ἰώ; for the corruption see 372–3n. The river is 'well disposed' (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 806) to the Argives because it supplies them with water; many in the audience would have known from first hand the importance of river-water for the military commissariat (cf. Hdt. 7.127.2).

Ajax's language is so general that the support of the river for the Trojans in *Iliad* 21 is too specific to be the referent. We can thus rule out conjectures that involve a polar error (235–6n.) such as Musgrave's δύσφρονες (for this corruption cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1021, *Ba.* 263, Dawe (1988) 105 = (2007) 143) and Ll-J/W's κακόφρονες (a misplaced attempt to secure responsion with the metrically anomalous strophe). εὐφρονες (*coni.* Heusinger (1745) 9 verso), another attempt to give responsion, introduces an epicism (disyllabic word-initial εὐ–) with decidedly unepic prosody (as Renchan (1992) 346 emphasises, it would have a long second syllable in epic).

421–6 οὐκέτ' ἄνδρα μὴ | τόνδ' ἴδῃτ'—ἔπος | ἔξερῶ μέγα— | οἶον οὕτινα | Τρωῖα στρατοῦ | δέρχθη χθονὸς μολόντ' ἄπο | Ἑλλανίδος 'you will never see this man again – I shall utter a proud boast – a man whose equal Troy did not see in the army which came from the land of Greece.' Ajax speaks of himself in terms which no one apart from him could accept: it is a standard datum of myth that Ajax was *second* best fighter among the Greeks at Troy, after Achilles.

Cf. 1338–41, Hom. *Il.* 2.768–9 ἀνδρῶν αὖ μέγ’ ἄριστος ἔην Τελαμώνιος Αἴας | ὄφρ’ Ἀχιλεὺς μῆνιεν with Brügger *et al.*, *Od.* 11.469–70 = 24.17–18, 11.550–1 περὶ μὲν εἶδος, περὶ δ’ ἔργα τέτυκτο | τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ’ ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα, Alcaeus fr. 387 Voigt Κρονίδα βασιλῆος γένος Αἴαν τὸν ἄριστον πεδ’ Ἀχιλλέα, Pind. *N.* 7.27 κράτιστον Ἀχιλῆος ἄτερ, Winnington-Ingram (1980) 14–15; the hierarchy even featured in Attic drinking songs, as at Carm. Conv. 898 *PMG* παῖ Τελαμώνος Αἴαν αἰχμητὰ, λέγουσί σε | ἐς Τροίαν ἄριστον ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν μετ’ Ἀχιλλέα, 899 τὸν Τελαμῶνα πρῶτον, Αἴαντα δὲ δεύτερον | ἐς Τροίαν λέγουσιν ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν μετ’ Ἀχιλλέα. The black-figure amphora by Exekias which depicts Ajax and Achilles playing a board game (*c.* 520; Kossatz-Deissmann (1981) §397) has Achilles, but not Ajax, with his helmet on; Achilles is on a slightly higher stool, and has cast a higher throw. This implies that he is the greater warrior (thus Mommsen (1988) 447, Lowenstam (2008) 39–43).

Ajax’s parenthesis ἔπος ξερῶ μέγα turns an idiomatic negative command forbidding arrogance or blasphemy (386n.) into a first person declarative statement. Far from making his boast ‘milder’ (Schneidewin¹) or providing an apology for it (Jebb), this daring twist on a familiar expression indicates the extent of his defiant monomania (cf. Finglass (2005b) 631 n. 8). (Pind. *N.* 6.26–7 ἔλπομαι | μέγα εἰπὼν σκοποῦ ἄντα τυχεῖν, cited by Campbell, is not comparable, since the boast is made on behalf of a third party rather than the speaker, and refers to a precise claim about the victor’s family which is presumably true.)

Commentators since Eustathius (1133.51 = IV 144.13–16 Van der Valk) have compared Hom. *Il.* 18.104–6 ἀλλ’ ἦμαι παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐτώσιον ἄχθος ἀρούρης, | τοῖος ἐὼν οἷος οὗ τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων | ἐν πολέμῳ, usually to excuse Ajax’s claims (as in Garvie’s remark ‘such boasting is normal for an epic hero’); cf. 1.244, 412. But Achilles is the best fighter among the Greeks, and no one (not even Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1) disputes that. Ajax makes a claim which everyone else in the army and beyond would immediately reject. Jebb additionally compares Hom. *Od.* 9.19–20 εἴμ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, δς πᾶσι δόλοισιν | ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει. But again, Odysseus’ self-description is unremarkable and obviously true. His greatest stratagem, the Wooden Horse, has only just been sung by the bard Demodocus: ‘he thus has every right to start with the proud claim that his δόλοι have made him world-famous’ (Heubeck *ad loc.*). Such passages suggest that modesty was not a virtue among Homeric warriors, and that frank acknowledgement of one’s own achievements was often socially acceptable. (Cf. Plutarch’s essay Περὶ τοῦ ἀνεπιφθόνως αὐτὸν ἐπαινεῖν, Eustathius 94.46–95.2 = I 148.30–3 Van der Valk, on Hom. *Il.* 1.244 Δῆλον δὲ ὡς οὐκ αἰεὶ ψεκτὸν τὸ περιαιτολογεῖν κατὰ τὸν παροιμιαζόμενον Ἀστυδάμαντα. ἔστι δέ ποτε καὶ φιλοτίμου καὶ μεγαλοψύχου ἥθους ὁ τοιοῦτος ἔπαινος, καθὰ δηλοῖ καὶ ὁ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ

μαστιγοφόρος Αἴας καὶ ὁ Φιλοκτήτης δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐν Τραχινίαις Ἡρακλῆς καὶ ἔτεροι μυρίοι, 126.35–41 = 1 194.31–195.6, on 1.410–12.) They do not show that it was acceptable to make *any* self-aggrandising claim, however absurd or arrogant. Indeed, in the *Iliad* passage cited above Achilles immediately qualifies his boast with the words ἀγορῇ δέ τ' ἀμείνονές εἰσι καὶ ἄλλοι (18.106), delimiting the scope of his preeminence.

Objecting to Winnington-Ingram, M. Heath (1987) 179 n. 27 argues that 'the use of superlative expressions is not so jealously guarded in Homer', and cites *Il.* 7.289, 17.80, and 17.689. But in all those passages the superlative is attributed by a warrior to an enemy with whom he has fought in a close-run duel, or to a fallen comrade; the exaggeration amplifies the speaker's κλέος by making his opponent seem more fearsome, or highlights the pathos of a death. For the first-person statement Heath can only adduce the *Iliad* 18 passage.

ἐξερῶ (*coni.* Porson (pre-1808a) 189) is found in H^{ac} without an accent (probably accidental), while most manuscripts have –έω. The trisyllabic form gives superior metre in the hypodochmiac context. The same reason commends Τρωῖα (*coni.* Hermann *ap.* Wunder¹) for manuscript Τροῖα. The form is metrically guaranteed at Aesch. *Cho.* 363 and Eur. *El.* 440 (cf. Sjölund (1938) 28–9). For the confusion see Radt on Pind. *Pa.* 6.75.

Hermann² suggests δέρχθη, but the augment can be omitted in lyric. Stinton (1976) 126 = (1990) 205 prints ἄπο for manuscript ἀπό; his text is perhaps marginally the better choice for a preposition after a noun and before an adjective, though the question was debated in antiquity (Probert (2003) 128). Whichever is right, Stinton correctly notes that period-end across the word group boundary ἄπο (or ἀπό) | Ἑλλανίδος is made easier by the preceding noun χθονός; he compares *Ti.* 509/10–511 ὁ δὲ Βακχίας ἄπο | ἦλθε παλίντονα Θήβας, *Phil.* 184–5 στικτῶν ἢ λασίων μετὰ | θηρῶν.

426–426/7 τανῦν δ' ἄτιμος ὧδε πρόκειμαι. 'But now I lie here like this, deprived of honour.' For self-pitying ὧδε (perhaps accompanied by a gesture indicating the dead animals) cf. e.g. *El.* 190–1 ὧδε μὲν | ἀεικεῖ σὺν στολᾷ. The focus returns from the expanses of the Trojan landscape to the immediate grim reality.

πρόκειμαι can be used of a corpse (cf. 1059, *Ant.* 1101, Aesch. *Sept.* 965, Eur. *Alc.* 1012; also πρόθεσις as a part of funerary ritual, for which see Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 143–4, 360), and may suggest that Ajax is not far from such a state (cf. Burton (1980) 22); the context certainly implies Ajax's imminent death. For the shift back to the first person verb cf. 864–5, *OC* 1329 (τῷδ' ἀνδρὶ followed by τοῦμοῦ), *OR* 534–5 (τοῦδε τᾶνδρός followed by τῆς ἐμῆς), Bruhn §183. The well attested variant πρόκειται assumes a continuing third person viewpoint, but as at 865, a concluding first person is more forceful. Moreover, the third person is appropriate at 419a–426 because Ajax is describing himself

from the viewpoint of others, which is no longer the case in this closing sentence.

428–9 οὗτοι σ' ἀπείργειν οὐθ' ὅπως ἔω λέγειν | ἔχω, κακοῖς τοιοῖσδε συμπεπτωκότα. 'I do not know how to restrain you or how I could let you speak, fallen as you are among such troubles.' For simultaneous incapacity in action and speech, together with the change of construction after ἔχω, cf. *Ant.* 270–2 οὐ γὰρ εἴχομεν | οὐτ' ἀντιφωνεῖν οὐθ' ὅπως δρῶντες καλῶς | πράττοιμεν. Neither this passage nor 1280 fits the distinction found in ancient sources (see Ellendt s.v. ἀπείργω) between ἀπείργειν 'stop something which has not yet begun' and ἀνείργειν 'stop something that is already in progress' (cf. Gardiner (1987) 62–3 n. 24). Elmsley (1811b) 492 changes οὐθ' to οὐδ', but a good case can be made for retaining the paradosis in this and similar passages (cf. *El.* 1197n., 1412n., West (1990) 151).

FIRST EPISODE, PART TWO (430–595)

430–80 Like the lyric that precedes, Ajax's speech fails to make contact with the people around him, concentrates on his humiliation and disgrace without considering the ethical implications of his stance, and concludes by identifying suicide as the only way out of his predicament. The emotional level is as intense as in the song, but with the emphasis now on intellectual, analytical emotion in place of the more overt kind displayed in the lyric (M. Heath (1987) 179; cf. *El.* 254–309n.). The speech falls into two sections, the first of which (430–56) looks backwards in time. After reflecting on the terrible appropriateness of his name (430–1n.), Ajax compares his deeds unfavourably to those of his father, Telamon (434–40n.). Past facts then yield to past counterfactuals: if only Achilles himself had made the award (441–4), or if only Ajax's mission had been a success (447–9), then things would be quite different. Both fantasies quickly encounter present reality, introduced each time by νῦν δέ, followed by a reference to his enemies, the Atridae and Athena. His dilemma recalls that of Achilles in *Iliad* 1 and 9; but he, unlike Achilles, has already tried and failed to make the Greeks pay for their error; and returning home is not an option (cf. Gill (1996) 205–8).

The second part (457–80) looks forwards; Ajax cannot change the past, but he still has some control over his future. An extended piece of *hypophora* (460–70) picks up a briefer section from the lyric (403–4); cf. *Pl. Ap.* 37bc, where Socrates considers alternatives (prison, a fine, exile) to awaiting execution, *C. Gracchus* fr. 61 Malcovati *quo me miser conferam?*, and *El.* 534–46n. Despite its length, it contains only two possible courses of action; Ajax vividly imagines both and enunciates their consequences. His father plays an important part (462–5), as he does at the conclusion of the *hypophora*, where Ajax justifies his chosen course on the ground that his father will approve it (470–2); this

provides a thematic link to the first section of the speech. Rejecting both flight and fight, Ajax has only suicide left; he buttresses this decision with a powerful series of gnomic statements (473–80), which apparently leave no further room for argument.

430–I αἰαῖ· τίς ἂν ποτ’ ᾤεθ’ ὥδ’ ἐπώνυμον | τοῦμόν ξυνοίσειν ὄνομα τοῖς ἐμοῖς κακοῖς; ‘*Aiai*. Who could ever have thought that my name would thus correspond to my sorrows?’ After the plangent tones of lyric, Ajax expresses his grief in a self-consciously intellectual conceit, which relies on Greek belief that ὄνομα reveals φύσις (cf. Griffith (1978) 84 n. 5). For tragic etymologies see Diggle on Eur. *Pha.* 225 (p. 148), Collard on Eur. *Suppl.* 496–7a, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 45, 162 (‘Io’s name is ominously associated with, if not derived from, a cry of lamentation’), Sulzberger (1926) (including examples from other genres). Halleran (1992) sees a specific allusion to Aesch. *Ag.* 681–99, but similarity is limited to the opening line τίς ποτ’ ὠνόμαζεν ὥδ’ εἰς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως, and even that is not close. See also 574–6n. The Hesiodic *Megalai Eoiai* contain a more optimistic etymology, where Heracles tells Telamon to name his son Αἴας after the appearance of an eagle (αἰετός; fr. 250 M–W). Pindar gives the same account: ἔσσεταί τοι παῖς, ὃν αἰτεῖς, ὦ Τελαμών· | καὶ νιν ὄρνιχος φανέντος κέκλευ ἐπώνυμον εὐρυβίαν Αἴαντα, λαῶν | ἐν πόνοις ἐκπαγλὸν Ἐνυαλίου (*I.* 6.52–4). For ξυμφέρω cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 243, Eur. *Held.* 919–20, *El.* 527, Call. 1114 *HE* ἴδ’ ὡς τῶργω [*coni.*] τοῦνομα συμφέρεται.

432[–433] νῦν γὰρ πάρεστι καὶ δις αἰάζειν ἐμοί, [| καὶ τρίς· τοιοῦτοις γὰρ κακοῖς ἐντυγχάνω·] ‘For now I may say *ai* twice indeed [and thrice – for such are the sorrows that I am encountering –].’ The deletion of 433 by Morstadt (1864) 43 is correct, for two reasons. (i) αἰάζειν is properly ‘say αῖ’; Ajax’s statement in 432 explains αἰαῖ in 430, which contains αῖ twice (thus Campbell). The phrase ‘both twice and thrice’ (cf. Pl. *Gorg.* 498c, *Phileb.* 60e, *Leg.* 956e, Friedländer (1938b) = (1969) 206–9; more commonly ‘twice and thrice’, for which cf. *Phil.* 1238 δις ταῦτ’ ἀβούλη καὶ τρίς ἀναπολεῖν μ’ ἔπη;., Aesch. *Pers.* 1033, *Cho.* 792–3, Theogn. 633, [Demodocus] fr. 5.3 *IEG*, Semon. fr. 7.64 *IEG*, Radermacher (1904) 1–2), suggesting a large but indeterminate number, is inconsistent with this precision. So also at 940 δις οἰμῶσαι the adverb refers to two cries (937, 939). (ii) The close syntactic and semantic relationship between 432 and 434, the latter beginning a clause which explains a proposition advanced in the former (ἐμοί, | ὅτου; cf. Eur. *Med.* 1347–8 ἐμοὶ δὲ τὸν ἐμὸν δαίμον’ αἰάζειν πᾶρα, | ὅς οὔτε λέκτρων νεογάμων δνῆσομαι κτλ.), is broken by 433. Misunderstanding of καὶ in 432 as a connective may have prompted the interpolation, leading to the insertion of καὶ τρίς (thus Morstadt) while the rest (a banal statement perhaps suggested by κακοῖς in 431) was added to fill out the line. Or perhaps δις was amplified to the familiar δις καὶ τρίς by someone who found Ajax’s lament numerically unsatisfying.

434–40 In a ‘carefully balanced antithesis’ (M. Heath (1987) 180, with analysis), Ajax compares his own achievements unfavourably with those of his father Telamon (cf. 462–5), who had sacked Troy with Heracles a generation before (434–6n.). The two expeditions had already been juxtaposed in literature and the visual arts. The Aeginetan temple of Aphaea (490s: Burnett (2005) 29 n. 3) depicts the two conflicts on its east and west pediments, emphasising the persistent valour of the Greeks, especially the Aeacids, through the generations (cf. Burnett pp. 29–44, Simon (2003) 20–5); one figure on each side should probably be identified with Ajax and Telamon (Burnett pp. 38–9). The same motive prompted Pindar’s description, in an ode for an Aeginetan victor composed perhaps shortly after 480, of how the Aeacids σύν μάχαις | δις πόλιν Τρώων πρᾶθον, ἐσπόμενοι | Ἡρακλῆι πρότερον, | καὶ σύν Ἀτρείδαις (*I.* 5.35–8; see Burnett p. 96); cf. also Carm. Conv. fr. 899 *PMG* τὸν Τελαμῶνα πρῶτον, Αἴαντα δὲ δεύτερον | ἐς Τροίαν λέγουσιν ἔλθειν Δαναῶν μετ’ Ἀχιλλέα. The comparison in our play is one of contrast, not similarity; the focus is on Ajax and Telamon, not the wider Aeacid clan or the Greeks as a whole.

In the *Iliad* Agamemnon attacks Diomedes for failing to live up to the prowess of his father Tydeus (4.370–400; cf. 5.800–13); his charioteer Sthenelus rejects the criticism on the ground that they captured Thebes whereas their fathers had not (4.404–10). A son would normally expect to live up to his father’s standards (cf. M. Heath (1987) 183 n. 33), and glorify him and his house through his successes (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 478–9 with Hutchinson, Pind. *P.* 11.13–14, *CEG* 183.4 (Athens, 446–425) εἶλετο τὰν ἀρετὰν, πατέρα εὐκλείζων ἐνὶ δήμῳ, Strauss (1993) 79–81, Griffith (1998) 32–4, 61–2, Stoevesandt on Hom. *Il.* 6.209). See also 545–82n.

434–6 δτου πατήρ μὲν τῆσδ’ ἀπ’ Ἰδαίας χθονὸς | τὰ πρῶτα καλλιστεῖ’ ἀριστεύσας στρατοῦ | πρὸς οἶκον ἦλθε πᾶσαν εὐκλειαν φέρων ‘I whose father came home from this land of Ida bringing every kind of fame, after winning the fairest prize for valour in the army.’ The prize in question was Hesione, daughter of Laomedon; Teucer (her son) later declares that Heracles awarded her to Telamon (1300–3). According to Homer (*Il.* 5.638–42, 648–51), Heracles came to Troy with six ships and sacked the city because Laomedon defrauded him of some horses, presumably the same beasts given by Zeus to Tros, Laomedon’s grandfather, as recompense for Ganymede (5.265–8). Elsewhere Homer refers to a wall built by Athena and the Trojans to protect Heracles from a sea-monster (κῆτος; 20.145–8), as well as to a wall built by Poseidon for Laomedon while Apollo looked after his cattle (7.452–3); the Trojan king subsequently cheats them of an unspecified reward (21.441–57). These elements appear in a later version of the Heracleian sack. Two vases from the mid-sixth century show Heracles and the sea-monster doing battle

as a young woman looks on (Oakley (1997) 624), but the attack on Troy itself is not found on vases (Burnett (2005) 39 n. 39). Pisander, an archaic poet of uncertain date (*GEF* pp. 22–3), first associates Telamon with the expedition: Heracles gave him a goblet (ἄλεισον) as his ἀριστεῖον from the campaign (fr. 10 *GEF*). Heracles' expedition is mentioned in passing in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 165.9–13 M–W). In Pindar, Telamon is brought by Heracles on an expedition against Troy 'because of the sins of Laomedon' (*I.* 6.26–30), and kills Laomedon while fighting alongside Iolaus (*N.* 3.36–7); his involvement in the sack is also implied at *I.* 5.35–8. He also appears in the depiction of the expedition on the Aeginetan temple of Aphaea (434–40n.).

The fullest early account, attributed to Hellanicus, is given in a Homeric scholium (fr. 26b *EGM*; cf. fr. 26d, 108). Cheated by Laomedon, Poseidon sends a sea-monster against Troy; Laomedon is told in an oracle to offer it his daughter Hesione to save the city. He does so, but announces that he will award the immortal horses, given by Zeus to Tros, to anyone who can kill the beast. Heracles achieves this feat, with the help of a defensive wall built by Athena; but Laomedon secretly gives him mortal horses instead. Realising this deceit, Heracles makes war against Troy and sacks the city. A separate fragment (fr. 109) associates Telamon with Heracles' sack: he gets into the city before his companion and brings down part of the wall.

The award of an ἀριστεῖον to Telamon by Heracles is thus firmly established as pre-Sophoclean, as probably is the association of Hesione with the Heracleian sack (she will be the young woman on the vases from the mid-sixth century; the reference to the sea-monster in Homer suggests that the story is older still). S. is the first attested author to make Hesione Telamon's prize (cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 1.9, Apollodorus 3.12.7). He does not mention Heracles, probably to allow a purer contrast between father and son. See further Degen (1900) 31, Fontenrose (1959) 347–50 (citing later accounts), Michael Anderson (1997) 92–7.

For δοτις as a causal relative cf. 1055, Friis Johansen (1959) 126 n. 80, Moorhouse 273–4. ὅδε refers to the place in which the speaker is located (parallels at W. Barrett (2007) 324–5). For καλλιστεῖον 'fairest prize' cf. *IC* 1 viii/4*.a.9–10 (Argos, c. 450) τῶν δὲ φαλύρων [= λαφύρων] τὰ μὲν καλλ<1>στεῖα Πυθῶδε ἀπ[ά]γεν, *IG* xii/9 189.36 (c. 340) and 207.19 (294–288), both from Eretria. The nature of the prize may influence its use here as a variant on ἀριστεῖον.

The form and sense of 436 are similar to *Ti.* 645/6 (Heracles) σοῦται πάσας ἀρετὰς λάφυρ' ἔχων ἐπ' οἴκους. For intensifying πᾶσαν attached to an abstract cf. *Phil.* 120 πᾶσαν αἰσχύνην ἀφείς.

437–40 ἐγὼ δ' ὁ κείνου παῖς, τὸν αὐτὸν εἰς τόπον | Τροίας ἐπελθὼν οὐκ ἐλάσσονι σθένει, | οὐδ' ἔργα μείω χειρὸς ἀρκέσας ἐμῆς, | ἄτιμος Ἀργείοισιν ὦδ' ἀπόλλυμαι. 'But I, that man's son, having come to the same land of Troy

with no weaker a force, and after performing no lesser deeds of might, am perishing like this, dishonoured among the Argives.’ For the periphrasis τόπον Τροίας cf. *OR* 1134 τὸν Κιθαίρωνος τόπον, perhaps fr. 1089 *TrGF* (if we read Ρειτῶν τόπος, but see Radt), Aesch. *Ag.* 191 ἐν Αὐλίδος τόποις, LSJ⁹ s.v. τόπος 1.1. The prefix in ἐπελθών denotes hostile intent (LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐπέρχομαι 1.1b), not Ajax’s arrival after Telamon. οὐκ ἐλάσσονι σθένει is modelled on παντὶ σθένει, an expression common in prose (Thuc. 5.23, Dem. 3.6 etc.), which S. uses at fr. 904.2 *TrGF*. Contrast Hom. *Il.* 4.407, where Diomedes and Sthenelus capture Thebes παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ’ ὑπὸ τείχος ἄρειον (*sc.* than the original Seven).

For ἔργα . . . χειρὸς . . . ἐμῆς cf. 618 ἔργα χεροῖν with n. ἀρκέω usually means ‘ward off, defend, suffice’ (Lynn-George (1993) 215–20), yet the required sense here is ‘performed’, just as at 590 it apparently means ‘perform service’. Jebb compares ἐπαρκέω at Aesch. *Ag.* 1170 ἄκος δ’ οὐδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν; but ‘furnish’ or ‘provide’ is not quite the same. No emendation is to hand, and the two passages support each other.

The language of 440 picks up that of 426–426/7, linking speech with lyric. As ἄτιμος is close to the sense of a passive verb, the dative of judgment Ἀργείοισιν (598, 1282, K–G 1 421–2) is close to a dative of agent (*ib.* 422–3): ‘the Argives are at once the agents and the witnesses of Ajax’ dishonour’ (Campbell; cf. Arnott on Alexis fr. 259.4 *PCG*).

441 καίτοι τοσοῦτόν γ’ ἐξεπίστασθαι δοκῶ ‘And yet, I think I know this, at least’. As with καίτοι τοσοῦτόν γ’ οἶδα at *OR* 1455 and *El.* 332, the understated phrase expresses confidence in the following statement. For καίτοι see 158–9n. γ’ is omitted in some manuscripts and corrupted to δ’ in OV; for the latter confusion cf. 476 and (in reverse) 546. δοκῶ accompanies strong assertion at e.g. *El.* 61.

442–4 εἰ ζῶν Ἀχιλλεὺς τῶν ὀπλων τῶν ὦν πέρι | κρίνειν ἐμελλε κράτος ἀριστείας τινί, | οὐκ ἂν τις αὐτ’ ἐμαρψεν ἄλλος ἄντ’ ἐμοῦ. ‘that if Achilles were alive and had been going to award the victory for supreme valour in a contest for his own arms, no one else would have seized them instead of me.’ For ὅς ‘suus’ see *El.* 128n., adding Bruhn §79. Either κρίνειν or κρινεῖν (thus Blaydes!) is equally possible after ἐμελλε (cf. Jebb on *OR* 967). For κρίνω with the prize as the object (rather than the dispute or its participants) LSJ⁹ s.v. π 3a compare Pind. *P.* 8.83–4 τοῖς οὐ . . . νόστος . . . | ἔπαλπνος . . . κρίθη. For κράτος ἀριστείας cf. *I.* 8.5 ἀέθλων . . . κράτος ἐξεῦρε.

445–9 Ajax’s accusations of malpractice seem more an expression of outrage than a plausible charge (cf. Van Erp Taalman Kip (1971) 143–5, 271, (1996) 524–31). They will be repeated by Teucer, and strongly denied by Menelaus (1135–7n.).

445–6 νῦν δ' αὖτ' Ἀτρεΐδαι φωτὶ παντουργῷ φρένας | ἔπραξαν, ἀνδρὸς τοῦδ' ἀπώσαντες κράτη. 'But as things are, the Atreidae have made them over to a man depraved in his character, rejecting my mighty deeds.' For νῦν δέ cf. 1060, Verdenius on Pind. *O.* 12.17. παντουργός is otherwise unattested until Imperial Greek; the usual form is πανοῦργος. For παν– used in criticism of Odysseus see 379–80n.; for this particular phrase cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 671 φωτὶ παντόλμω φρένας. Juxtaposition of φρένας (183–5n.) and κράτη (cf. *El.* 689 οὐκ οἶδα τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἔργα καὶ κράτη, where hendiadys clarifies the sense) is pointed: 'Ajax speaks with scorn of those varied mental resources of which he does not feel the need' (Campbell).

For ἔπραξαν cf. Polyb. 4.17.12 τούτοις ἔπραττον τὴν πόλιν, Plut. *Pomp.* 51.5 πράττειν μὲν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπαρχιών καὶ στρατοπέδων ἡγεμονίας; although no classical parallel is known, πράττω does denote intrigue more generally at *OR* 124–5 ζῦν ἀργύρῳ | ἐπράσσειτ' ἐνθὲνδ' and Thuc. 4.121.2, 5.83.1, and cf. also *Ant.* 1034–5 κοῦδὲ μαντικῆς | ἄπρακτος ὑμῖν εἰμι. The verb needs the object αὐτ'; the variant ὦδ' may come from a scribe thinking back to 440 or forward to 449.

Hartung's ἔπρασαν (aorist of πέρνημι, 'sell') is approved by Dawe, *STS* 1 140; for confusion of ξ and σ cf. 656, 715, and for the confusion of these verbs see Aesch. *Cho.* 132. But the form is paralleled only by ἔπρησεν on an inscription from Samos (*IG* XII/6 561, c. 540); in Homer the aorist is ἐπέρασσε. Moreover, the verb gives an unwelcome specificity to Ajax's charge; if money changed hands, or was thought to have, it is surprising that more is not made of it. (πέρνημι can be used metaphorically, as at *Phil.* 978 and Aesch. *Cho.* 132, but here the context would imply a literal usage.) The paradosis, by contrast, matches the vague bluster employed by Teucer (1135–7n.).

447–9 κεῖ μὴ τόδ' ὄμμα καὶ φρένες διάστροφοι | γνώμης ἀπήξαν τῆς ἐμῆς, οὐκ ἂν ποτε | δίκην κατ' ἄλλου φωτὸς ὦδ' ἐψήφισαν. 'And if my eyes and mind had not become disordered and swerved away from my intended design, they would never have voted such a judgment against another man.' Before the night assault, Ajax decided on his plan (γνώμη); but before he could accomplish it, his vision (ὄμμα) and mental state (φρένες) became disordered (διάστροφοι). He presents this as swerving away (ἀπήξαν) from the true course of his plan (contrast the metaphorical use of ὁρθός to denote success); this involved a literal swerving at the commanders' hut (53 ἐκτρέπω). Ajax's menacingly implied threat is born from present powerlessness: cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.231–2 οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις | ἧ γὰρ ἂν ['for otherwise'], Ἀτρεΐδῃ, νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο. Contrast the similar formulation at 100, where Ajax is confident that he has defeated his enemies.

διάστροφ– denotes disorder and/or madness in the eyes (cf. *Tr.* 794–5 διάστροφον | ὀφθαλμὸν ἄρας, Page on Eur. *Med.* 1174–5, Papadopoulou (2005)

64) and φρένες ([Aesch.] *PV* 673 φρένες διάστροφοι with Sansone (1975) 75–6, Aesch. *Suppl.* 1017 ἵχνος τὸ πρόσθεν οὐ διαστρέψω φρενός with FJ/W, Hippocr. *Coac.* 217 ἐπὶ ὀμμάτων διαστροφῇ). For the combination of rolling eyes and erring φρένες in the context of madness cf. Eur. *Ba.* 1122–3 διαστρόφους | κόρας ἐλίσσουσ', οὐ φρονοῦσ' ἄ χρη φρονεῖν, [Aesch.] *PV* 881–2 κραδία δὲ φόβῳ φρένα λακτίζει, | τροχοδινεῖται δ' ὄμμαθ' ἐλίγδην. Contrast ἀποστρόφους (69–70n.). The minority reading διάστροφοι φρένες gives less natural word order, since the adjective goes with both nouns; it probably arose through *vitium Byzantinum* (302–4n.).

The minority variants ἀπείρξαν (*coni.* ed. Lond. 1722) and ἀπήξαν (perhaps not a variant, but the result of failure to write iota subscript) have won some support, with μ' inserted before them by Blaydes² and Kamerbeek (1950) 18 respectively. But the sense of the former, 'my warped mind kept me back from my judgment', is less dynamic than the *paradosis*; while the aorist ἤξα of ἄγω is extremely rare in Attic (cf. Antiph. 5.46, K–B π 347; outside Attic, Timoth. fr. 791.153 *PMG* = Hordern puts it in the mouth of a Persian).

Instead of ὦδ', Reiske (pre-1774) 3 recto suggests οἶδ'; for the corruption cf. 544. If transmitted, no one would object to it.

450–3 νῦν δ' ἡ Διὸς γοργῶπις ἀδάματος θεὰ | ἤδη μ' ἐπ' αὐτοῖς χεῖρ' ἐπευθύνοντ' ἐμήν | ἔσφηλεν ἐμβαλοῦσα λυσσώδη νόσον, | ὥστ' ἐν τοιοῖσδε χεῖρας αἰμάξαι βοτοῖς. 'As it is, when I was already directing my hand against them, the daughter of Zeus, the invincible Gorgon-eyed goddess, frustrated me by casting a maddening sickness upon me, so that I bloodied my hands among beasts like these.' The elaborate description of Athena makes Ajax's foe seem more formidable (cf. 952–3): only she could have stopped him. For his knowledge of Athena's intervention see 401a–402n.

Διὸς denotes paternity (172–5n.). γοργῶπις is applied to Athena at fr. 844.2 *TiGF* τὴν Διὸς γοργῶπιν Ἐργάνην and Eur. *Hel.* 1315–16 ἃ δ' | ἔγχει Γοργῶπις [B. Heath: Γοργῶ cod.] πάνοπλος; elsewhere she is γοργοφύνα (Eur. *Ion* 1478) and γοργολόφα (Ar. *Eq.* 1181), while her shield is γοργῶψ and γοργωπός at Eur. *El.* 1257 and *Ion* 210 respectively. In the *Iliad* Athena bears the aegis which depicts a Gorgon's head (5.741–2), and her shield portrays a Γοργῶ βλοσυρῶπις . . . | δεινὸν δερκομένη (11.36–7); they are also associated in art (Halm-Tisserand (1986)). The Gorgon analogy is also applied to those other divine agents of madness, the Erinyes (thus Leumann (1950) 155), as at Eur. *Or.* 261 (γοργῶπις), Aesch. *Cho.* 1048, *Eum.* 48; cf. also the maddened Heracles, who διαστρόφους ἐλίσσει σῖγα γοργωπούς κόρας (Eur. *Her.* 868), and the furious Typhon, who ἐξ ὀμμάτων . . . ἥστραπτε γοργωπὸν σέλας ([Aesch.] *PV* 356). Even when Gorgons are not mentioned, the eyes of Athena are distinctively piercing: cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.199–200 αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω | Παλλάδ'

Ἀθηναίην· δεινὸν δέ οἱ ὅσσε φάνθεν, Alcaeus fr. 298.24 Voigt ἃ δὲ δεινὸν ὑπ' [ὅ] φρυσιν, Bacchyl. 16.20 ὀβριμοδερκής.

ἄδάματος means both 'invincible' and 'virgin' (cf. Gould (1980) 53 = (2001) 144), just as δαμάζω means both 'break in' (an animal) and 'conquer'. This orthography (*coni.* Elmsley (1805/6 edn) may be in Λ ('met vrij groote zekerheid', according to Scheltema (1948)); other manuscripts have ἄδάμαστος. A Sophoclean papyrus of the second century AD reads ἄδα]μάτοις (fr. 441a.10 *TrGF*), which is also metrically guaranteed. Three other occurrences of ἄδάμαστος (or -ντος) in S. must be emended to ἄδάματος on metrical grounds (*OR* 205, 1315/16, and *OC* 1572); the change is also required at Aesch. *Suppl.* 143, 153, *Sept.* 233, *Cho.* 54, and Eur. *Phoen.* 640. While here metre allows either form, the principle of economy suggests that Elmsley is right. The error was probably caused by the Homeric (metrically guaranteed) ἄδάμαστος at *Il.* 9.158, which is also the form transmitted at Xen. *Mem.* 4.1.3, *Eq.* 1.1; cf. Hesych. α 996 (1 37 Latte) ἄδάματος· ἄδάμαστος, ἀνυπότακτος.

ἐπευθύνοντ' (*AC*, *coni.* Valckenaer on Eur. *Hipp.* 1183) is superior to the variants ἐπεντύνοντ' ('readying', a less immediate and dramatic sense) and ἐπεντεύινοντ' (meaning unclear). Some editors claim that ἐπευθύνοντ' is in L before correction, although I see no evidence for this in the facsimile; neither did Pearson (1923) 22–3 or Stanford, and the latter consulted the original manuscript, too.

For ἐμβάλλω cf. *OC* 1391–2 καλῶ δ' Ἄρη | τὸν σφῶν τὸ δεινὸν μῖσος ἐμβεβληκότα, Hom. *Il.* 19.88 φρεσὶν ἐμβαλὼν ἄγριον ἄτην, Bacchyl. 11.53–4 ταῖσιν δὲ χολωσαμένα | στήθεσσι παλίντροπον ἐμβαλεν νόημα; also 51–2n. The *Suda*'s λυσσώδει νόσῳ (α 428 = 1 46.9 Adler, *prob.* Hemsterhuis *ap.* Ruhnkenius' on Timaeus p. 77) would give 'by casting me into grievous sickness' (cf. perhaps [Hes.] fr. 176.2 M–W κακῇ δὲ σφ' ἐμβαλε φήμη [Schwartz: –ήν –ήν codd.]), which is no improvement. λυσσώδης is attested elsewhere at Hom. *Il.* 13.53 and Eur. *Ba.* 981; for the adjectival suffix –ώδης see 1187/8–1191n. The scholium παρὰ τὴν αἰχμὴν αἰχμάσσει (p. 117 Chr.) makes αἰχμάσσει (*coni.* Nauck⁺ p. 182) a possibility (cf. 97n.).

454–5 κείνοι δ' ἐπεγγελῶσιν ἐκπεφευγότες, | ἔμοῦ μὲν οὐχ ἐκόντος. 'And they have escaped, against my will, and are laughing.' The eloquent preverbs emphasise how Ajax's enemies have escaped *from* him and are now laughing *at* him. For the corruption in the minority variant οὐκ ἔχοντος see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 635 (III 12–13). Naber (1881) 213 suggests οὐ κιχόντος ('because I did not find them'), but the paradosis better conveys the fundamental idea that this is not what Ajax wanted.

455–6 εἰ δέ τις θεῶν | βλάπτοι, φύγοι τᾶν χῶ κακὸς τὸν κρείσσονα. 'But if one of the gods causes harm, then even a coward can escape the stronger man.'

Even as Ajax admits the power of the gods, he nevertheless emphasises that he is κρείσσων (to his human enemies). Cf. *El.* 696–7 ὅταν δέ τις θεῶν | βλάπτῃ, δύναιτ' ἄν οὐδ' ἄν ἰσχύων φυγεῖν, with n. for βλάπτω of divine agency (cf. 940–1n.). Optative βλάπτοι may seem remote given that Ajax knows that divine intervention has occurred, and Reisig's βλάπτει (*teste* Dawe³; also Morstadt (1864) 43) would be an easy slip before φύγοι; but the optative 'states the general truth in the form of a future possibility' (Moorhouse 282).

A minority of manuscripts have τ' ἄν (first recorded by Erfurdt in 1811, from Mosq. gr. 504), which is a way of writing τῶν (i.e. crasis of τοι and ἄν), not an error (cf. Dawe (1968) 10, *STS* 1 141); Elmsley (1814) 360 first writes this as τᾶν. For τοι 'with a proverb or general reflection . . . forc[ing] the general truth upon the consciousness of the individual addressed' (Denniston 542–3) cf. 520, 580, 988, 1350, perhaps 1266; it also occurs 'early in the apodosis of a conditional sentence' (*ibid.* 547).

457–9 καὶ νῦν τί χρὴ δρᾶν; ὅστις ἐμφανῶς θεοῖς | ἐχθαίρομαι, μισεῖ δέ μ' Ἑλλήνων στρατός, | ἐχθεὶ δὲ Τροία πᾶσα καὶ πεδία τάδε. 'And now what must I do? I who am manifestly hated by the gods, while the army of the Greeks loathes me, and all Troy and these plains hate me.' Ajax is detested by gods and men (cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.200–2 (Bellerophon) ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσι . . . πᾶτον ἀνθρώπων ἁλείων, Pind. *P.* 2.43 (Centaurus) οὐτ' ἐν ἀνδράσι γερασφόρον οὐτ' ἐν θεῶν νόμοις), by Greeks and Trojans, and even by the land itself (cf. 819). δρᾶν μ' in N (*coni.* Morstadt (1864) 43) may result from elevation of a gloss (28n.) or failure to understand the construction. For the transition ὅστις . . . ἐχθαίρομαι, μισεῖ δέ μ' see Moorhouse 272–3, and (for the abruptness) *El.* 446n. For the combination of synonyms in μισεῖ δέ . . . ἐχθεὶ δέ Diggle on Eur. *Pha.* 264 compares *OR* 54 and *Tr.* 457.

460–1 πότερα πρὸς οἶκους, ναυλόχους λιπὼν ἔδρας | μόνους τ' Ἀτρείδας, πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον περῶ; 'Shall I abandon the station of the ships, leaving the Atridae alone, and go home across the Aegean sea?' The situation recalls Achilles' intention of crossing the sea back to Phthia as a result of his disaffection with the Greek leaders (Hom. *Il.* 9.356–63), although there are no verbal similarities. For the deliberative questions ('the natural follow-up to an aporetic question') see Mastronarde (1979) 9–10. The objection that the Atridae will not be alone if Ajax leaves (hence δισσοῦς *coni.* Morstadt (1864) 43), is literal-minded; rather, 'Ajax characteristically assumes that whoever is without *him* is truly alone' (Stanford). For μόνους see further 29–31n.

462–5 As he makes the comparison with his father's deeds (434–40n.), Ajax's language becomes 'full of the most basic images of shame, of sight and nudity' (B. Williams (1993) 85). Neither son nor father would be able to look the other in the eye, the one for shame, the other for contempt.

462–3 καὶ ποῖον ὄμμα πατρὶ δηλώσω φανείς | Τελαμῶνι; ‘And when I appear, how will I show my face [literally ‘what face will I show’] to my father, Telamon?’ For ‘the effrontery involved in looking in the eye those whom one has betrayed’ (Cairns (2005a) 146 n. 23; add ‘...insulted, or let down’) cf. 1290n., *OR* 1371–4 ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδ’ ὄμμασιν ποίοις βλέπων | πατέρα ποτ’ ἂν προσεῖδον εἰς Αἰδου μολών, | οὐδ’ αὖ τάλαιναν μητέρ’, οἶν ἐμοὶ δυοῖν | ἔργ’ ἐστὶ κρείσσον’ ἀγχιόνης εἰργασμένα, 1384–6, *Phil.* 110, *Eur. Med.* 467–72, *IA* 454–5 τί φήσω πρὸς δάμαρτα τὴν ἐμήν; | πῶς δέξομαι νιν; ποῖον ὄμμα συμβαλῶ;, *Ar. Ach.* 287/8–291/2, *Hdt.* 1.37.2 νῦν τε τέοισι με χρὴ ὄμμασι ἔς τε ἀγορὴν καὶ ἐξ ἀγορῆς φοιτέοντα φαίνεσθαι;, *Dem.* 19.69, [*Dem.*] 25.98 ποίοις προσώποις ἢ τίσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς πρὸς ἕκαστον τούτων ἀντιβλέψεσθε;, *Ov. Her.* 6.145, Cairns (1993a) 98–9 n. 151, 158, 292–3. Contrast 345n. For Ajax’s ὄμμα see 167–8n.

For καὶ ‘introducing an ... objection’ (Denniston 311) after a preceding rhetorical question cf. *OR* 355, *OC* 263. The position of Τελαμῶνι ‘enhances the weight of the proper name by placing it at the beginning of a line, isolating it from what follows, and leading up to it by means of appositional words’ (Fraenkel, in his edition of Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*, vol. II p. 8. n. 2; cf. 575, 846, 860).

463–5 πῶς με τλήσεται ποτ’ εἰσιδεῖν | γυμνὸν φανέντα τῶν ἀριστείων ἅτερ, | ὧν αὐτὸς ἔσχε στέφανον εὐκλείας μέγαν; ‘How ever will he bring himself to look upon me, when I appear naked, bereft of those prizes which he won as a great crown of glory?’ γυμνὸν is explained by τῶν ἀριστείων ἅτερ, as at 750, 908/9–910, *Phil.* 31 κενὴν οἰκῆσιν ἀνθρώπων δίχα, *Hom. Il.* 21.50 γυμνόν, ἅτερ κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος, οὐδ’ ἔχεν ἔγχος, Bruhn §211. Although Ajax is not literally without clothes (or armour: cf. *Hom. Il.* 16.815), the choice of word evokes the shame sometimes associated with this state: denied the arms of Achilles, Ajax believes himself to be as good as naked.

Blaydes¹ changes ὧν (original ᾧ attracted into the case of its antecedent τῶν ἀριστείων) to ὅν (original ᾧ attracted into the case of στέφανον, with which it is in apposition). Either is equally possible, so we may as well print the manuscript reading. For the ‘crown of glory’ cf. *Eur. Suppl.* 315 πόλῃ παρόν σοι στέφανον εὐκλείας λαβεῖν, fr. 853.4 *TrGF* κάλλιστον ἔξεις στέφανον εὐκλείας ἀεὶ (with Wilkins, in his commentary on Euripides’ *Heracleidae*, p. 194), *Her.* 1334–5, Blech (1982) 153–61; also *Eur.* fr. 134 *TrGF* εὐκλειαν ἔλαβον.

466–8 οὐκ ἔστι τοῦργον τλητόν. ἀλλὰ δῆτ’ ἰὼν | πρὸς ἔρυμα Τρώων, ξυμπεσὼν μόνος μόνοις | καὶ δρῶν τι χρηστόν, εἴτα λοίσθιον θάναω; ‘The deed cannot be endured. Well then, shall I set out against the rampart of the Trojans, join battle with them in single combat, just me against them – and then, as I perform some noble action, die at the last?’ Ajax’s thought recalls

that of Hector before his last assault on Achilles (Hom. *Il.* 22.304–5): μή μὲν ἄσπουδεῖ γε καὶ ἀκλείως ἀπολοίμην, | ἄλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυνθέσθαι. At Philostr. *Her.* 35.12 Ajax does launch an attack on the Trojans in his madness: μανέντα δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μὲν Τρῶες ἔδεισαν πλείω ἢ εἰώθεσαν, μή προσβαλὼν τῷ τείχει ῥήξῃ αὐτό, καὶ ὕχοντο Ποσειδῶνί τε καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι, ἐπειδὴ ἐς τὸ τείχος ἐθήτευσαν, προβεβλήσθαι τῶν περγάμων τοῦ ἄσπετος καὶ σχεῖν τὸν Αἴαντα εἰ τῶν ἐπάλλεων ἄπτοίτο.

For ἄλλα δῆτα in questions which ‘follow a rejected suggestion (including hypophora)’ see Denniston 273. For questions beginning ἄλλα following another beginning πότερον see *El.* 537n. For δῆτα in questions see 42n.

μόνος μόνοις implies that the battle will be between Ajax and the Trojans – no one else will interfere. (Similarly Jebb: ‘the Trojans will not have their attention distracted by any other Greek foe’.) For polyptoton of μόνος where one is singular, one plural, cf. Eur. *Med.* 513 σὺν τέκνοις μόνῃ μόνοις, *Andr.* 1221 μόνος μόνοισιν ἐν δόμοις, Pl. *Prot.* 316c (Socrates asks Protagoras) σκόπτει πότερον περὶ αὐτῶν μόνος οἷε δεῖν διαλέγεσθαι πρὸς μόνους, ἢ μετ’ ἄλλων (where μόνος refers to Protagoras, μόνους to Socrates and Hippocrates). The massive numerical disparity between Ajax and the Trojans might have led us to expect πολλοῖς μόνος (*coni.* Morstadt (1864) 43) or πᾶσιν μόνος (*coni.* Geel (1853) 208). But the chosen expression suggests that the contest will be a real match between two sides, thereby better indicating Ajax’s conception of his status as a warrior.

Elsewhere juxtaposed instances of μόνος are both singular: cf. 1283, Eur. *Hcl.* 807–8 ἐμοὶ μόνος μόνῳ | μάχην συνάψας, *Cycl.* 362, possibly Hdt. 9.48.3 (*coni.*), Wankel on Dem. 18.137 ὅστις τῷ ὑπὸ τῶν πολέμιων πεμφθέντι μόνος μόνῳ συνήει. For polyptoton in a military context cf. also *Ant.* 142 ταχθέντες ἴσοι πρὸς ἴσους, Eur. *Phoen.* 750. For μόνος of Ajax see 29–31n.

According to Radermacher, the phrase implies a series of μονομαχίαι, but it is undesirable for two instances of μόνος in polyptoton to have such different meanings. Radermacher’s preferred sense is closer to μόνος μόνῳ (*C^{ac}*, *coni.* Mekler *ap.* Dindorf⁶ p. xi), but even then the match is not exact. Moreover, the resulting sense ‘does less than justice to the grandiose conception of Ajax, who thinks of himself as taking on the whole might of Troy’ (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 28). Nor does Ajax have reason to expect such a chivalrous mode of combat from the Trojans.

Instead of ξυμπεσῶν **π** read ἐμπεσῶν, but ξυμ– better conveys the mutual clash between opponents implied in the polyptoton (cf. Eur. *Hcl.* 807–8, cited above). For the error cf. perhaps 622/3, *Ant.* 837a (though see Ll-J/W, *So.*, *ad loc.*), Eur. *Ion* 235, and Burzacchini and Neri (2004) 56–7 with nn. 10–11. For τι ‘something of value’ cf. Hom. *Il.* 22.305, Eur. *IA* [371] δρᾶν τι κεδνόν, *El.* 305–6n. For adverbial λοισθιον cf. *Ant.* 1304, Pind. *P.* 4.266.

469 ἀλλ' ὥδέ γ' Ἀτρείδας ἀν εὐφράναιμι που. 'But in that way I might give pleasure to the Atridae.' Cf. Theogn. 1032–3 μηδὲ φίλους ἀνία | μηδ' ἐχθροὺς εὐφραίνε. The aorist optative εὐφράναιμι is corrupted into the non-existent forms –αίναιμι (cf. N. Wilson (2007) 114: 'alpha was sometimes written with an additional rising stroke so as to resemble alpha followed by iota') and –άνοιμι.

470–2 οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα. πείρα τις ζητητέα | τοιάδ' ἄφ' ἧς γέροντι δηλώσω πατρὶ | μὴ τοι φύσιν γ' ἄσπλαγχνος ἐκ κείνου γεγώς. 'This cannot be. Some enterprise must be sought from which I may show my aged father that I, his son, am no coward.' The πείρα is suicide, as the audience may guess, and as the following *gnomai* make clear. Attitudes to suicide in the classical period were diverse (see Papadopoulou (2005) 166–7, with bibliography). No one here condemns it *per se*; the play rather explores the effects of the suicide, both in anticipation and after the event, on Ajax's φίλοι, and the ethical consequences of this.

The curt denial οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα recurs at *Tr.* 449, οὐκ ἔστι at *Tr.* 709, *Ant.* 289, *El.* 448, *Eur. Med.* 389, *Or.* 1097. Each of these cases is followed by ἀλλά, and Reiske (1753) 3 emends our passage to ἔστιν, ἀλλά, but for explanatory asyndeton in exactly this position cf. *Eur. Alc.* 53 οὐκ ἔστι· τιμαῖς κἀμὲ τέρπεσθαί δόκει, *Or.* 307–8 οὐκ ἔστι· σὺν σοὶ καὶ θανεῖν αἰρήσομαι | καὶ ζῆν.

For the final-consecutive use of the future cf. 1166–7, 1261, Moorhouse 274–5. As at *El.* 518 (n.), γε goes with the whole clause: 'I'll show him *this*'. For the nominative participle with δηλώω cf. 877–8, K–G II 52–3. The σπλάγχνα are regularly a seat of various emotions: cf. 995, *Aesch. Sept.* 237 κακὸς σπλάγχνος, *Anon. A.P.* 12.160.1–2 = 3776–7 *HE* τρηχεῖαν ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοισιν ἀνίην | οἶσω, Padel (1992) 13.

473–4 αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ἄνδρα τοῦ μακροῦ χρήζειν βίου, | κακοῖσιν ὅστις μηδὲν ἐξαλλάσσεται. 'For it is shameful that a man should desire a long life, if he experiences no variation in his misfortunes.' The same idea is voiced (by Ajax? Introduction p. 33) at *Aesch. Hoplon Krisis* fr. 177 *TrGF* τί γὰρ καλὸν ζῆν βίοτον ὃς λύπας φέρει; Cf. *S.* fr. 952 ὅστις γὰρ ἐν κακοῖσιν ἱμεῖρει βίου, | ἡ δειλὸς ἔστιν ἡ δυσάλητος φρένας with Pearson, *Ant.* 463–4 ὅστις γὰρ ἐν πολλοῖσιν ὡς ἐγὼ κακοῖς | ζῇ, πῶς ὁδ' οὐχὶ κατθανὼν κέρδος φέρει;

γάρ 'shows that the decision [*sc.* to die] has already been made and is pre-supposed as he rehearses his reasons' (M. Heath (1987) 181). The variant ἔστι for ἄνδρα simplifies the construction. For μακρὸς βίος and related expressions of long human life see FJ/W on *Aesch. Suppl.* 582. The generalising article (cf. 649) refers to the class (as it were) of long lives: cf. *OR* 518 οὗτοί βίου μοι τοῦ μακραίωνος πόθος, Moorhouse 146. For ἐξαλλάσσω in this context cf. *Pind.* *I.* 3.18–18b αἰὼν δὲ κυλινδομέναις ἀμέραις ἀλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξ | ἄλλαξεν.

475–6 τί γὰρ παρ’ ἡμᾶρ ἡμέρα τέρπειν ἔχει | ἥ προσθεῖσα κἀναθεῖσα τοῦ γε καθθανεῖν; ‘For what pleasure is there in one day following another, ἥ bringing a man towards and further from death?’ παρ’ ἡμᾶρ ἡμέρα denotes a succession of days: cf. Antiph. 5.72 μέγα τοι ἡμέρα παρ’ ἡμέραν γιγνομένη γνώμην, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἐξ ὀργῆς μεταστῆσαι, Gygli-Wyss (1966) 62 n. 1, Gow on Theocr. 11.69 ἄμαρ ἐπ’ ἄμαρ, possibly Pind. *P.* 11.63 (n.).

476 remains obscure. According to the usual explanation, Death is imagined as a fixed point or line, the final destination of the journey of life, and any given day can bring a man closer to or further from this terminus; the genitive τοῦ γε καθθανεῖν is governed by neighbouring κἀναθεῖσα, and τῷ γε καθθανεῖν is understood with the parallel participle προσθεῖσα. Three difficulties encumber this idea. (i) As Dawe, *STS* 1 141 points out, ‘the idea of moving Ajax now closer to death and now away from it is intrinsically peculiar’ (similarly West (1978a) 110). Ll-J/W (*ST*) counter that ‘the poet . . . is free to imagine the way in which one day brings a man nearer to death and another moves him away from it’; but such an image, in itself difficult to grasp, contradicts the immediately preceding emphatic statement of Ajax’s unchanging woe (473–4). παρ’ ἡμᾶρ ἡμέρα itself reinforces the idea of an unvarying sequence. (ii) The absence of a word for the fixed point or line, so crucial to the overall picture, is odd; contrast Eur. *El.* 955–6 (Don’t think you’ve beaten Justice) πρὶν ἂν πέρας [Weil ex Orione: πέλας cod.] | γραμμῆς ἵκηται καὶ τέλος κάμψη βίου, Hor. *Ep.* 1.16.79 *mors ultima linea rerum est*. (iii) Jebb sees a reference to a board game, in which a πεισός is moved forwards and backwards. But while ἀνατίθεμαι is found in this context, sometimes metaphorically (cf. [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 229c ὥσπερ πεττεύων ἐθέλω σοι ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἀναθέσθαι ὅτι βούλει τῶν εἰρημένων, Antiph. Soph. fr. 52 Pendrick ἀναθέσθαι δὲ ὥσπερ πεττὸν τὸν βίον οὐκ ἔστιν, Dodds on Pl. *Gorg.* 461d, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀνατίθμι B II 2), it means not ‘move a piece backwards’ (i.e. from some terminus on the board), but ‘retract a move’; and Ajax of all people should be aware that human actions cannot be annulled (377–8n.). A board game would be an unexpected metaphor in the context, and one might have thought that S. would have signalled it more clearly; contrast Eur. *Suppl.* 409 ὥσπερ ἐν πεισσοῖς, parenthetically inserted to clarify the image. (S.’s use of the active instead of the middle is not an additional argument against this interpretation, since τίθμι and τίθεμαι are interchangeable in some expressions: see Diggle (1983) 350 = (1994) 263–4.)

Textual alteration does not help. Brunck prints the minority variant κἀνεθεῖσα (aorist passive participle of ἀνίημι), citing a scholium ἀνεθεῖσα τοῦ καθθανεῖν, ἥ γουν ἀπολυθεῖσα καὶ ἐλευθερωθεῖσα τοῦ θανάτου (p. 201.21–3 Dindorf); but ‘it is very odd to speak of each day one lives as being released by death’ (West (1978a) 110). Pearson (1923) 23 conjectures κἀνιῖσα (present active participle of ἀνίημι), which unbalances the participles without compensating benefit. A lacuna, perhaps after κἀναθεῖσα, καθθανεῖν (both Dawe¹), or

ἔχει (LL-J/W, *So.*), is perhaps the most likely solution, as the Greek seems too abbreviated to make the sense clear; but no supplement commends itself.

γ (itself obscure: Denniston 116 admits that ‘δή *patheticum* would be more natural’) is corrupted to δέ in some witnesses (see 441n. for the error), while a few later manuscripts offer unmetrical τό instead of τοῦ.

477–8 οὐκ ἂν πριάμην οὐδενὸς λόγου βροτῶν | ὅστις κεναῖσιν ἐλπίσιν θερμαίνεται. ‘I would not buy a man for any price who is warmed by empty hopes.’ For metaphorical πρίασθαι in this context cf. *Ant.* 1170–1 τῶν ἐγὼ καπνοῦ σκιᾶς | οὐκ ἂν πριάμην. For οὐδενὸς λόγου as a genitive of value (S–D II 127, Moorhouse 55) cf. *OC* 1163 οὐ γὰρ ἦδ’ ἔδρα σμικροῦ λόγου, Hdt. 1.33 οὐ . . . λόγου μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται (hence ποιοίμην *coni.* Nauck³ p. 185 on our passage). Stobaeus’ βροτῶν (4.53.22 = v 1104.6 W–H) gives a construction parallel to that at 541–2, but the majority reading is simpler. (Editors call this Palmer’s conjecture, but he claims to know it from a manuscript; presumably he means Stobaeus.)

οὐκ ἂν πριάμην and related expressions are found several times in comedy: cf. *Ar. Pax* 1223 οὐκ ἂν πριάμην οὐδ’ ἂν ἰσχάδος μιᾶς, *Eupolis* fr. 99.20 *PCG* οὐ]δ’ ἂν τριχὸς πριάμην, *Plaut. Mil.* 316 *non ego tuam empsim vitam vitiosa nuce*, *Cas.* 347, Fraenkel on *Aesch. Ag.* 275, Collard (2005a) 370. (For the potential optative cf. *Tyrt.* fr. 12.1 *IEG* οὕτ’ ἂν μνησαίμην οὕτ’ ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθεῖν κτλ.) By specifying value in terms of λόγος rather than ἰσχάς or θρίξ S. ensures that his phrase is not merely colloquial; perhaps it retains the vigour of everyday speech while simultaneously assuming a dignity appropriate to this elevated moment.

For ‘empty hopes’ see *El.* 1460–1n., adding *Tr. Adesp.* fr. 640b.66 *TrGF* (v/2 p. 1134), *Mastronarde* on *Eur. Phoen.* 398, *Crinagoras A.P.* 7.376.1–2, 9.234.1 = 1853–4, 2054 *GP*. The weaker καλαῖσιν in *Stobaeus* (3.7.2, 4.53.22 = III 308.18, v 1104.7 W–H), which describes the hopes from the perspective of their possessor, fails to justify the condemnation in 477; it may have crept in from καλῶς in 479. θερμαίνω denotes giving comfort or joy, as at [*Aesch.*] *PV* 684–5 μηδέ μ’ οἰκτίσας | ξύνθαλπε μύθοις ψευδέσιν, *Aesch. Cho.* 1004, *Eur. El.* 401–2 χαρᾶ | θερμαινόμεσθα καρδίαν; cf. *Headlam* on *Herodas* 1.20, *Zink* (1962) 8, *Padel* (1992) 117 with n. 11, *El.* 888n. For the expression as a whole cf. *Bacchyl.* 13.220 ἐλπίδι θυμὸν ἰαίν[.

479–80 ἀλλ’ ἢ καλῶς ζῆν ἢ καλῶς τεθνηκέναι | τὸν εὐγενῆ χρή. ‘But the noble man must either live well or die well.’ Ajax implies that a glorious death is preferable to a life of shame: cf. *El.* 989n., adding *Tr. Adesp.* fr. 537 *TrGF* κατθανεῖν γὰρ εὐκλεῶς | ἢ ζῆν θέλοιμ’ ἂν δυσκλεῶς, *Seaford* on *Eur. Cyl.* 201. For the idea of a noble or beautiful death cf. *Vernant* (1982) = (1989) 41–79 ≈ (1991) 50–74. For the antithetical formulation at the end of a speech see 132–3n.

480 πάντ' ἀκήκοας λόγον. 'You have heard the whole story.' For similar summing-up formulae cf. Aesch. fr. 47a.21 *TrGF* πᾶντ' ἔχει[ς] λόγον, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 582, Beroutsos on Men. *Asp.* 82, Collard (2005a) 376. In Ajax's mouth the phrase suggests that there is no place for discussion: everything that could be said, has been.

481–4 οὐδεὶς ἔρεῖ ποθ' ὡς ὑπόβλητον λόγον, | Αἴας, ἔλεξας, ἀλλὰ τῆς σαυτοῦ φρενός. | παῦσαι γε μέντοι καὶ δὸς ἀνδράσιν φίλοις | γνώμης κρατῆσαι τάσδε φροντίδας μεθείς. 'No one will ever say that the words which you spoke were not true to yourself, Ajax – no, they come from your own mind. But stop, let your friends rule your judgment, and dismiss these thoughts.' 'To attack the Atridae and, having failed, to kill himself – that is a true expression of the mind of Ajax' (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 29, comparing the chorus's words at 183–5). The chorus's intervention is highlighted, being twice as long as usual. They do not respond to the news that Ajax had intended to kill the Greek chiefs; exclamations of horror would hardly serve their intention of calming his passion. Moreover, from a dramatic perspective, the focus is now not on what Ajax has done, but on what he should do. In the *Iliad* Ajax himself rebukes Achilles for failing to heed his friends (9.630–1, 640–2), advice for which Achilles has some regard (9.644–55).

For the sense of ὑπόβλητον λόγον see 188–90n. The minority variant ἀπόβλητον, 'worthless' (cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.361 οὔτοι ἀπόβλητον ἔπος ἔσσεται), fails to balance the ἀλλά clause; for the corruption see 301–2n. 'No one will say' is equivalent to 'no one could say'; Headlam on Herodas 4.73 cites parallels. For the variant Αἴαν see 89–90n. σαυτοῦ is corrupted to αὐτοῦ in LK; although αὐτοῦ / ἑαυτοῦ for σαυτοῦ / σεαυτοῦ is paralleled in tragedy (K–G 1 572, Wackernagel (1926–8) 11 94–5 = (2009) 518–19), the substitution becomes much commoner in later Greek (see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1672–3), and so was more likely to be inserted than removed in error. For the positive continuation of οὐδεὶς after ἀλλά cf. *Ant.* 263 κούδεὶς ἐναργής, ἀλλ' ἔφευγε μὴ εἰδέναι, fr. 354.6–7 *TrGF*, Wackernagel (1926–8) 11 312 = (2009) 790; also 1326–7, *El.* 72n. For the sense of φρήν see 183–5n. For adversative γε μέντοι cf. *Ant.* 233, Denniston 412.

485–524 Ajax's speech was a pure expression of his character, with no reference to an audience beyond himself. Tecmessa's, by contrast, is an attempt to persuade Ajax to change his mind, and is filled with rhetorical strategies aimed at that purpose. She emphasises her respect for him (485, 489–90, 502, 514–19), the intimacy which they have shared (490–3, 520–1), and, by implication, their common exposure to the blows of fortune (485–6n.). Her main theme, however, is the consequence of suicide for his φίλοι. Ajax had focussed on the binary relationship between him and his father, that unmatched winner of glory, in a 'dangerously constricted social context which provides the domain

of his moral endeavour' (Lawrence (2005) 22). Tecmessa encourages him to see that as only one of a whole network of significant relationships: with his father, yes, but also his mother, wife, and child. Three of these arranged in an ascending tricolon dominate the central section (506–13). She begins with his father, emphasising not past glories but the present misery of old age (506–7), and urging on Ajax an αἰδώς towards him which springs from pity rather than fear. Her reference to his mother highlights not just her wretched state, but also her passionate desire for the return of her son (507–9). The third and longest appeal (set apart from the others by a change of imperative and an emphatic vocative) is by their son, Eurysaces; its complex syntax packs in emotionally heightened phrases as she encourages Ajax to imagine his life without his father (510–13).

Flanking this central passage are two sections concerned with Tecmessa herself. In the first (485–505), she binds her own fate to Ajax's: his death will cause her ruin (496–9), and her ruin will be his disgrace (500–5). In the last (514–24), she emphasises her lack of any other guardian (514–19), and reminds him that both his past actions and hers place a moral obligation on him to cherish and protect her (520–4). Thematic and rhetorical considerations link the sections. So in the first, Tecmessa describes how she came to Ajax's bed (συνηλθον, 491), before invoking him by their union on that same bed (συνηλλάχθης, 493); she movingly reprises this theme in the last, reminding Ajax of the pleasure which she has given him (thus Winnington-Ingram (1983b) 238). The first section describes Tecmessa's past enslavement at the hands of Ajax (487–90) and potential future enslavement thanks to Ajax's suicide (496–505); the last connects past and future for a present rhetorical purpose, as Tecmessa reminds Ajax that since he removed her from the familial networks in which he, for one, is still entwined (cf. 506–13), he now has a responsibility to protect her (514–19). In the first section the insults received by the enslaved Tecmessa will be αἰσχροὶν for Ajax, even after his death; in the last Ajax's failure to respect the demands of χάρις will prevent him from being truly εὐγενής. This last, especially telling, point is the culmination of Tecmessa's efforts to make Ajax see that the ethical obligations of real nobility are broader than he imagines.

Wisely, Tecmessa does not mention the army or its leaders; the absence of a reference to the chorus is less predictable, but allows the focus to fall wholly on Ajax's γένος. Nor does she address the question of how he could protect himself and his γένος against the likely hostility of the army; there is no obvious answer, and since Ajax has concentrated on ethical rather than practical considerations it makes rhetorical sense for her to do the same. Far from being expressed 'only from her own point of view . . . [and] hopelessly out of touch with her husband's' (Reinhardt (1947) 28 = (1979) 19), the speech is a powerful reminder to Ajax of what will happen if he ignores

his obligations to others; their suffering and disgrace will only intensify his own ruin.

Tecmessa's speech repeatedly alludes to the encounter between Hector and Andromache in *Iliad* 6; the implications of this are traced in the notes (485–6n., 496–9n., 500–4n., 504–5n., 514–19n.).

485–6 ὦ δέσποτ' Αἴας, τῆς ἀναγκάας τύχης | οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν μείζον ἀνθρώποις κακόν. 'Lord Ajax, there is no greater evil for mortals than the fate imposed by compulsion.' Tecmessa refers to her own state of slavery, but the expression is general enough to include a reference to Ajax's situation (*pace* Friis Johansen (1959) 113 n. 36). They have both suffered at the hands of fortune, she implies, and so have 'a bond of shared suffering and mutual sympathy' (M. Heath (1987) 182). Furthermore, he, like her, should learn to cope with his suffering: 'she is not so naïve . . . as to propose this to Ajax as a philosophy of life that he might himself wish to adopt, but perhaps she hopes to curb to some extent his extreme inflexibility' (Lawrence (2005) 24).

For the address see 368n. For the variant Αἴαν see 89–90n. The opening generalisation identifies something bad (expressed in the familiar form 'there is nothing worse than . . .': cf. Tr. Adesp. fr. 502 *TrGF* οὐδείς ἀνάγκης μείζον ἰσχύει νόμος, Long (1968) 150 n. 9) which plays an important part in the subsequent speech; cf. Eur. *Med.* 446–7 οὐ νῦν κατεῖδον πρῶτον ἀλλὰ πολλάκις | τραχεῖαν ὀργὴν ὡς ἀμύχανον κακόν, *Andr.* 184–5 κακόν γε θνητοῖς τὸ νέον ἔν τε τῷ νέῳ | τὸ μὴ δίκαιον ὅστις ἀνθρώπων ἔχει. The reference to ἀναγκαία τύχη (cf. 803, *El.* 48, Eur. *IA* 511; also Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 513–14, on δεινὴ ἀνάγκη, and Hector's anticipation at *Il.* 6.458 that κρατερὴ . . . ἀνάγκη will drive his wife into slavery) is vague and ominous: 'agents . . . are not fully conscious of . . . supernatural necessities in advance. They may have a sense that there is a necessity involved, but not be sure what it is; for them, the outcome may, at the time, seem like luck' (B. Williams (1993) 104).

487–8 ἐγὼ δ' ἐλευθέρου μὲν ἐξέφυν πατρός, | εἶπερ τινὸς σθένοντος ἐν πλούτῳ Φρυγῶν. 'I am the offspring of a free father, mighty and wealthy, if any of the Phrygians was.' Tecmessa's main point is the mutability of fortune, but this reference to her ancestry (210n.) also bolsters her status and right to be heard. Cf. Hor. *C.* 2.4.13–14 (addressed to a man ashamed at his love for a slave-girl) *nescias an te generum beati | Phyllidis flavae decorant parentes: | regium certe genus et penatis | maeret iniquos*.

For the construction cf. *OC* 733–4 πρὸς πόλιν δ' ἐπίσταμαι | σθένουσαν ἥκων, εἴ τιν' Ἑλλάδος, μέγα, *Tr.* 7–8 νυμφείων ὄτλον | ἄλγιστον ἔσχον, εἴ τις Αἰτωλὶς γυνή, Thesleff (1954) 190; 'the hypothetical clause εἶπερ τις is attracted, as a sort of pronoun, into the construction of the clause on which it depends' (Campbell). ἐγὼ δέ moves from general to particular, as at *Ant.* 1196,

Aesch. *Ag.* 1377, Eur. *Med.* 225; cf. also εἰ τις (καὶ) ἄλλος, illustrated by Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 2.3. For ἐν (effectively ‘because of’) cf. 1017, *Phil.* 185.

489–90 νῦν δ’ εἰμι δούλη. θεοῖς γὰρ ᾧδ’ ἔδοξε που | καὶ σὴ μάλιστα χειρί. ‘But now I am a slave. For such, I suppose, was the decision of the gods, and certainly of your hand.’ Cf. Ach. Tat. 5.17.3 “Ἐλέησόν με,” ἔφη “δέσποινα, γυνὴ γυναικα, ἐλευθέραν μὲν, ὡς ἔφυν, δουλὴν δὲ νῦν, ὡς δοκεῖ τῇ Τύχῃ”. For που in cautious assertions about divine activity cf. Wackernagel (1895) 22 = (1953–79) 1 701, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 182–3 (π 112), R. Parker (1999) 16. μάλιστα can denote ‘the most likely explanation or outcome’ (*El.* 932n.; cf. *Phil.* 617); here the nuance is slightly different, giving not ‘you are more likely to have decided than the gods’, but ‘I can’t be sure the gods decided, but I know that you did’. Cf. B. Williams (1993) 104–5: ‘Her bad luck may possibly have been written in the stars, but it was quite certainly imposed on her by force.’ The expression also contains a ‘passing hint of praise of his prowess’ (M. Heath (1987) 182). For the combination of human and divine contributions to a given outcome cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 436–7 ἔκατι μὲν δαιμόνων, | ἔκατι δ’ ἁμᾶν χερῶν, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 811.

490–1 τοιγαροῦν, ἐπεὶ | τὸ σὸν λέχος ξυνῆλθον, εὖ φρονῶ τὰ σά ‘Therefore, since I came to your bed, I have been well disposed to you.’ This may hint at the idea that sex reconciles a woman to a feared or hated partner: cf. 492–3n., Eur. *Tro.* 665–6 καίτοι λέγουσιν ὡς μὴ εὐφρόνη χαλᾷ | τὸ δυσμενὲς γυναικὸς εἰς ἀνδρὸς λέχος. The particle τοιγαροῦν appears first in S., and then in verse and prose (Denniston 566–8). For the bare accusative after ξυνῆλθον cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.31 ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιόωσαν. The συν- prefixes here and in 493 ‘signify her willing co-operativeness in acting like a proper wife, though she is the prize of his spear’ (Gill (1996) 208 n. 119).

492–3 καὶ σ’ ἀντιάζω πρὸς τ’ ἔφεστίου Διὸς | εὐνῆς τε τῆς σῆς, ἣ συνηλλάχθης ἐμοί ‘and I supplicate you by Zeus of the hearth and by your bed, in which you entered into partnership [thus MLW] with me’. The hearth, as the most sacred place of the house, often features in supplications (*El.* 269–70n., adding R. Parker (2005) 13–15). Zeus ἔφέστιος (together with Hestia herself) is one of its guardians: so at Hdt. 1.44.2 Croesus calls on him to avenge the death of his child at the hands of a man whom he had welcomed into his home. By invoking this deity, Tecmessa emphasises that she is a member of the household and deserves the respect and protection which comes from that (cf. M. Heath (1987) 182). After beginning with Zeus (823–4n.), she puts more rhetorical emphasis on the second part of her appeal (for the effect of such ordering see Pind. *P.* 11.22–7n.), which is longer, has more clauses, returns to a point just mentioned (490–1n.), and refers to a more intimate location and activity. Since συνηλλάχθης can mean ‘had intercourse’ or ‘made peace’

(Ormand (1996) 49; cf. Gardiner (1987) 75 n. 40), it may evoke the reconciling effects of sex (490–in.), as perhaps at Eur. *Andr.* 1245 Ἐλένω συναλλαχθεῖσαν εὐναιοῖς γάμοις (of Andromache, called a γυναῖκα αἰχμάλωτον at 1243), *IA* 1156–7 τὰ μὰ δ' ἔσχατος αὐτὴ λέχη. | οὐ σοὶ καταλλαχθεῖσα κτλ. (Clytemnestra to Agamemnon). It also looks forward to Tecmessa's closing appeal (520–4).

494–5 μή μ' ἀξιώσης βάξιν ἀλγεινὴν λαβεῖν | τῶν σῶν ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν, χειρίαν ἐφείς τινι 'do not think it right that I should suffer painful words from your enemies, abandoning me to one of them as his subject' (Lloyd-Jones, adapted). βάξιν ἀλγεινὴν λαβεῖν (paralleled by Davies on *Tr.* 819–20) is followed by ὑπό as if a passive verb; cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 576–7 κλέος | τοιόνδε... ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων λαβεῖν, *Held.* 598–9 τιμωτάτη | ... ὑφ' ἡμῶν... ἔση. The adjective χείριος is a poetic substitute for ὑποχείριος, found only in tragedy and satyr-play in classical Greek (Aesch. *Suppl.* 507 χειρία [Valckenaer: χεῖρι καὶ cod.] λόγους σέθεν, Eur. *Andr.* 411, 628, *Ion* 1257, *Cycl.* 177, perhaps fr. 175.2 *TrGF* on *TrGF*s p. 87, *suppl.* Diggle (1996b) 165). It may pick up σὴ μάλιστα χεῖρι from 490: after submitting to the hands of Ajax, Tecmessa is in danger of being consigned to the hands of another. Either of the variants ἐφείς and ἀφείς is possible (for the dative with the latter in this context cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 305–6), and the error would be paralleled in both directions (see Diggle (1984a) 57 = (1994) 285); in this context ἐφείς was more likely to be corrupted, given ἀφῆς at the end of the following line.

496–9 ἦ γὰρ θάνης σὺ καὶ τελευτήσας ἀφῆς, | ταύτη νόμιζε κάμει τῇ τόθ' ἡμέρᾳ | βίᾳ ξυναρπασθεῖσαν Ἀργείων ὑπο | ξὺν παιδί τῷ σὺ δουλίαν ἔξιν τροφήν. 'For on the day that you die and abandon me by your death, be sure that on that very day I too will be forcibly dragged off by the Argives, together with your own son, and reduced to a life of slavery.' At Hom. *Il.* 6.454–5 Hector tells Andromache that he fears the day ὅτε κέν τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων | δακρυόεσσαν ἄγεται, ἐλεύθερον ἡμαρ ἀπούρας.

Finglass (2009e) 92–5 justifies ἦ (*coni.* Bothe¹) against manuscript ἦν or εἶ (ταύτῃ, *coni.* Blaydes¹, could also be right). Accented σὺ in 496 is opposed to ἐμέ in 497. τελευτήσας ἀφῆς balances the aorist subjunctive θάνης; the variant τελευτήσεις ἀφείς removes this by introducing a future. There is no need to supply μ' before ἀφῆς (*coni.* Battier (pre-1744) 612); cf. *OR* 461–2, where μ' (interpolated into 461) can be understood from ἐμέ in the next line (thus Pearson (1929a) 95). νόμιζε is 'common in drama as an exhortation to individual addressees' (Arnott on Alexis fr. 271.4 *PCG*); cf. Headlam's edition of Herodas, p. 407. κάμει denotes 'I too will suffer'; Tecmessa assimilates her fate to Ajax's. δουλίαν ἔξιν τροφήν is a powerful climax: cf. *Tr.* Adesp. fr. 376 *TrGF* δεινὴ τις ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικὶ συμφορὰ | δούλοις γενέσθαι δεσπότης τε δυσχερεῖς [Valckenaer: –τυχεῖς codd.] | λαβεῖν. For τροφή 'way of life' see *El.* 1183n.; for ἔχω, *OC* 1687 δύσοιστον ἐξομεν τροφάν.

500–4 Tecmessa puts the description of her likely fate into the mouth of an anonymous bystander (a ‘τις–Rede’: *El.* 973–85n.). This especially evokes Hector’s use of the same device at *Hom. Il.* 6.459–63: καὶ ποτέ τις εἴπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσιν: | “Ἐκτορος ἦδε γυνή, ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι | Τρώων ἱπποδάμων, ὅτε Ἴλιον ἀμφεμάχοντο.” | ὥς ποτέ τις ἑρέει· σοὶ δ’ αὖ νέον ἔσεται ἄλγος | χητεῖ τοιοῦδ’ ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἦμαρ. Both speeches begin by referring to the woman as the wife/partner of Hector/Ajax, followed by a relative clause stating that the relevant warrior was preeminent among the army (denoted by a partitive genitive). Tecmessa’s conclusion, referring to her fall from prosperity (503), does not correspond to anything in Hector’s τις–Rede, perhaps because he has only just described that possibility in detail for his wife (6.454–8). After the τις–Rede comes the formula ‘so someone will say’ (504n.), followed by a reference to the impact of the imaginary speaker’s words (504–5n.). Such extensive similarities highlight a crucial difference. In the *Iliad* Hector uses the τις–Rede, demonstrating thereby an imaginative concern for his wife’s likely fate hard to imagine in the mouth of S.’s Ajax (for the closest he gets to it see 850–1). S. transfers the device to Tecmessa, on whose lips it becomes a plea to a warrior lacking the sympathy of his Homeric counterpart. See further 545–82n., Eustathius 656.45–8 (π 367.18–23 Van der Valk), Perrotta (1935) 144–7, Easterling (1984), Pratt (2007) 26–31.

500–1 καὶ τις πικρὸν πρόσφθεγγμα δεσποτῶν ἑρεῖ | λόγοις ἰάπτων ‘And one of my masters will speak a bitter saying, assaulting me with his words’. For the orthography of πρόσφθεγγμα see 14n. For metaphorical ἰάπτω cf. *Aesch. Ag.* 1547–9 αἶνον . . . | . . . ἰάπτων, Rhianus fr. 1.4 *CA*. Instead of ἰάπτων the scholiast to L records the variant ἀτίζων (‘dishonouring’), perhaps an emendation.

501–3 “ἴδετε τὴν ὀμεινέτιν | Αἴαντος, ὃς μέγιστον ἴσχυσε στρατοῦ, | οἷας λατρείας ἀνθ’ ὅσου ζήλου τρέφει.” ‘Behold the partner of Ajax, who was mightiest of the army! What servitude she endures after being so envied!’ This imperative introduces a τις–Rede at *El.* 977 ἴδεσθε τῷδε τῷ κασιγνήτῳ, φίλοι, *Eur. Alc.* 955 ἰδοῦ τὸν αἰσχροῦς ζῶνθ’, ὃς οὐκ ἔτλη θανεῖν, and *Held.* 29–30 ἴδεσθ’, ἐπειδὴ παισὶν οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ, | Ἰόλαος οὐκ ἦμυε συγγενὴς γεγώς. The relative clause after the address is common in this rhetorical form (*El.* 978–9n.). For the contrast between past felicity and present woe cf. *Tr.* 284 ἐξ ὀλβίων ἀζηλον εὐροῦσαι βίον (also of female prisoners-of-war), *Livy* 30.42.18 *ceterorum miserabilior oratio fuit, commemorantium ex quantis opibus quo recidissent Carthaginiensium res*.

ὀμεινέτις is found only here in classical Greek; masculine –έτης (or –έτας) occurs at *Eur. Ion* 894 (Creusa of Apollo, in lyric) and *Med.* 953 (Medea, referring to Jason with false politeness). Later we find ὀμεινός (Maiistes *Aret.* 3 *CA*, Nic. *Ther.* 131) and ὀμεινίς (*Lyc. Alex.* 372). This distribution may suggest

an elevated form, with the imaginary speaker emphasising on a lexical level the contrast between Tecmessa's former state and current misery.

The description of Ajax as 'mightiest of the army' is exaggerated (421–6) but rhetorically effective; it makes Tecmessa's imagined fall from grace more dreadful, and flatteringly agrees with Ajax's own perspective (421–6n.). Blaydes' p. 320 conjectures ἴσχυε, but 'the aorist expresses termination more plainly than the imperfect, which would only imply it' (Moorhouse 193; cf. *El.* 1145n.). For exclamations beginning οἶος see 367n. For the plural λατρείας cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 225 Φοιβεΐαισι λατρείαις; this, the *difficilior lectio*, should be preferred to the minority variant οἶαν λατρεῖαν (*coni.* Blaydes¹). For τρέφω with a persistent evil as object cf. 644, *Phil.* 795 τρέφοιτε τήνδε τὴν νόσον, *OC* 185/6–186/7 δ τι καὶ πόλις | τέτροφεν ἄφιλον, *Ti.* 817; the two different objects create a slight zeugma (thus Moussy (1969) 72).

504 τοιαῦτ' ἐρεῖ τις 'Such things someone will say.' For similar conclusions to τις–Reden cf. Eur. *Alc.* 959–60 τοιάνδε πρὸς κακοῖσι κληδὼνα | ἔξω, 1005 τοίαις νιν προσερούσι φήμαις [Dobree: τοῖαι . . . φῆμαι codd.], Hom. *Il.* 4.182, 6.462, 7.91 ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει, 22.108 and *Od.* 6.285 ὥς ἐρέουσιν.

504–5 κάμει μὲν δαίμων ἔλῃ, | σοὶ δ' αἰσχροῦ τάπη ταῦτα καὶ τῷ σῶ γένοι. 'And as for me, my fate will pursue me, but to you and your family these words will be shameful.' At Hom. *Il.* 6.462–3 (cited 500–4n.), Hector describes the grief which the anonymous speaker will cause Andromache. Tecmessa, however, 'merely glances at the results to herself' (Jebb) and emphasises the consequences to Ajax, even though he will be dead by then. By saying that it will be αἰσχρόν to him rather than e.g. ἀλγυνόν (cf. νέον ἔσsetai ἄλγος in the Homeric passage), she uses a word most likely to appal: disgrace, rather than grief, is what he fears (cf. 473). For other references to negative consequences of a τις–Rede cf. *Od.* 6.285 ἐμοὶ δέ κ' ὀνειδέα ταῦτα γένοιτο, Eur. *Alc.* 960–1 τί μοι ζῆν δῆτα κέρδιον [Purgold: κύδιον codd.], φίλοι, | κακῶς κλύοντι καὶ κακῶς πεπραγότει; A δαίμων denotes 'the divine agent responsible for a man's good or ill fortune at any given time' (West on Hes. *Op.* 122–3).

506–13 The concluding reference to Ajax's γένος in 505 unobtrusively introduces a section dealing with Ajax's family. Tecmessa appeals to him by his father, mother, and son, in three distinct sections, each beginning with an imperative, which progressively increase in length. The culminating appeal by Eurysaces allows a smooth transition to Tecmessa herself in the final part of the speech (514–24).

The idea that children should look after their parents in old age, already found in early epic (cf. Hom. *Il.* 24.540–1 (Achilles on Peleus) οὐδέ νυ τὸν γε | γηράσκοντα κομίζω, Hes. *Th.* 604–5 (the man without a wife, and thus childless) ὀλοὸν δ' ἐπὶ γῆρας ἴκηται | χήτεϊ γηροκόμοιο), and fundamental

to Athenian law and life (cf. Xen. *Oec.* 7.19, [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.6, Diog. Laert. 1.55, Richardson (1933) 56–8, Bolkestein (1939) 80, Strauss (1993) 65, Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 6.6), is reflected in drama, where the absence of a γηροβοσκός is often a cause for lament (cf. 570, Eur. *Med.* 1032–6, *Suppl.* 923, *Phoen.* 1436; also *Alc.* 662–4, Ar. *Ach.* 676–8, *Thesm.* 1353–7). Ajax will preclude that anxiety, at least, by transferring his filial duties to his own son (565–70); this too will have been a situation familiar in real life.

506–7 ἀλλ’ αἰδεσσαι μὲν πατέρα τὸν σὸν ἐν λυγρῷ | γήρᾳ προλείπων ‘But have reverence for your father, whom you are deserting in wretched old age.’ At Hom. *Il.* 24.486–92 Priam appeals to Achilles by his aged father, who is ὀλοῶν ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ (487); earlier Priam refers to his status as an aged father in his entreaty to his son Hector (22.59–76). Cf. also Anticleia’s description of Laertes awaiting the return of his son Odysseus: κεῖτ’ ἄχέων, μέγα δὲ φρεσὶ πένθος ἄέξει | σὸν νόστον ποθέων· χαλεπὸν δ’ ἐπὶ γήρας ἰκάνει (*Od.* 11.195–6).

For ἀλλά introducing an imperative see n. on 194a. ἐν λυγρῷ γήρᾳ reworks a Homeric expression: cf. *Il.* 18.434–5 (Thetis to Achilles, of Peleus) ὁ μὲν δὴ γήραϊ λυγρῷ | κείται ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἀρημένος, 5.153, 10.79, 23.644 (all γήραϊ λυγρῷ), 19.336–7, *Od.* 24.249–50, Eur. *Her.* 649–50 τὸ λυγρὸν φόνιον τε γήρας μισῶ, Posid. fr. 43.6 A–B (*suppl.*). For the ‘strong emotional character’ of προλείπω in contexts of separation (Olson on Ar. *Pax* 114–17) cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 748, Eur. *Alc.* 391, 396, *IA* 1466, Hom. *Od.* 23.120, Theogn. 1102, *CEG* II 486.1 (4th c. BC) ἦ[δ’] ἔθανεν προλιπῶσα πόσιν καὶ μη[τέρα, Medda (1998) 134–5. The participle (parallels in Diggle (1991) 59) is superior to the infinitive προλείπειν (*coni.* Wolff³) because it implies that Ajax is already in the process of abandoning his father (thus Jebb, citing Xen. *Cyr.* 5.1.21 τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι λέγων· τὸ δὲ . . . αἰσχυνοίμην ἂν εἶπεῖν).

507–9 αἰδεσαι δὲ μητέρα | πολλῶν ἐτῶν κληροῦχον, ἥ σε πολλάκις | θεοῖς ἄρᾳται ζῶντα πρὸς δόμους μολεῖν· ‘Have reverence for your mother, whose allotted portion is great old age, and who prays continuously to the gods that you will come home alive.’ The chorus (622/3–633) and Ajax himself (850–1) later imagine Eriboea’s reaction to news of her son’s affliction and death. In his appeal to Achilles, Priam attributes a similar feeling to his father Peleus (Hom. *Il.* 24.490–2): ἥτοι κείνός γε σέθεν ζῶντος ἀκούων | χαίρει τ’ ἐν θυμῷ ἐπὶ τ’ ἔλπεται ἥματα πάντα | ὄψεσθαι φίλον υἱὸν ἀπὸ Τροίηθεν ἰόντα. In the *Odyssey* Penelope prays for the safe return of her son Telemachus (4.762–6); anxiety for her absent son Odysseus leads to the death of Anticleia (11.197–203).

For verbs in anaphora linked by μὲν . . . δέ see Diggle (1981a) 55. κληροῦχος denotes the holder (ἔχω) of an allotment (κληρος), the nature of which is defined by ἐτῶν (Moorhouse 54); for the accompanying genitive cf. Alexis fr. 93.1–2 *PCG* Ἐρμῇ θεῶν προπομπῇ καὶ Φιλιππίδου | κληροῦχε (‘the living Philipides so resembled a corpse . . . that Hermes Guide of Souls already

had a claim on him' – Arnott). Bare κληροῦχος in prose usually refers to the possessor of an allotment of land (often overseas).

510–13 οἴκτιρε δ', ὦναξ, παῖδα τὸν σόν, εἰ νέας | τροφῆς στερηθεὶς σοῦ
διοίσεται μόνος | ὑπ' ὀρφανιστῶν μὴ φίλων, ὅσον κακὸν | κείνῳ τε κάμοι
τοῦθ', ὅταν θάνῃς, νεμεῖς. 'Take pity, lord, on your son, for all this misfortune
that you will cause to him, when you die, and to me too, if he is to live bereft
of care, separated from you, under the control of unfriendly guardians.' οἴκ-
τιρε (thus Nauck³ for transmitted οἴκτειρε: 121–2n.) governs ὅσον . . . νεμεῖς, to
which εἰ . . . διοίσεται is the protasis; cf. fr. 659.8–9 *TrGF* καὶ ἀνοικτίρμων τις
οἰκτίρειέ νιν | πτήσσουσαν αἰσχύνῃσιν οἷα μαίνεται, Xen. *Cyr.* 7.3.14, Bar-
rett on Eur. *Hipp.* 877–80, K–G II 370–1. Before Lobeck¹ put a comma after
φίλων, editors punctuated there with a stop, which would make εἰ . . . διοίσεται
dependent on οἴκτιρε, and ὅσον . . . νεμεῖς an independent exclamation 'loosely
attached' to what precedes (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 29 n. 54). But as Pear-
son notes (in his abridgment of Jebb's edition), τοῦθ' works better with the
former interpretation; moreover, a new sense unit beginning with ὅσον would
be uncomfortably staccato.

For νέα τροφή referring to the nurture of the young cf. *OC* 345–6 ἡ μὲν ἐξ
ὄτου νέας | τροφῆς ἔληξε καὶ κατίσχυσεν δέμας, *El.* 1143, Moussy (1969) 86.
Absolute διαφέρομαι 'lead one's life' is paralleled by [Eur.] *Rhes.* 982 διοίσει,
where Fries compares Hippocr. *Artic.* 56 for the middle; Lobeck prefers 'male
tractabitur', but that puts the emphasis on actual abuse rather than (as in the
rest of the passage) neglect and loneliness, and Jebb shows that his parallel for
the sense in this context is unsafe. For ὑπό 'under (the influence of)' cf. *OC* 391
τίς δ' ἂν τοιοῦδ' ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς εὖ πράξειεν ἄν; Moorhouse 130. μὴ φίλων is an
emphatic litotes (examples at FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 812–14).

The orphan was a paradigmatically vulnerable member of society (cf. Hom.
Il. 22.487–507, Hes. *Op.* 330, Pl. *Leg.* 927c, [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.6–7 on ὀρφανῶν
κάκωσις). In Athens orphans came under the responsibility of the eponymous
archon (cf. [Dem.] 43.75, Arnaoutoglou (1998) 6–7); children of men killed
fighting for the democracy were supported by the state (*SEG* 28.46, 403/2).
See further 574–6n., Weiler (1988) 23–9, Hübner and Ratzan (2009b) 14–15.
ὀρφανισταί are attested in laws from Histria (*IScM* I 184.1, 3rd c.), Selymbria
(*IGSK* LVIII S3.A.2 τ[ο]ι οἱ ὀρφανισταὶ ζαμίοντι[, Hellenistic), and Ephesus (*IGSK*
XI/1 4.28–9 ἐπιτροπον ὑπὲρ ὀρφανοῦ καὶ τοὺς συ[νορφανιστάς, 297/6); in
other states we find ὀρφανοφύλακες (*IMI* I 1B.76 = Arnaoutoglou (1998) §98,
Beroea, before 167; *IG* IX/1²/3 624g.4 and 643.2 and 7, both Naupactus,
c. 150); *FD* III/2 168.28–9, c. 129), ὀρπανοδικασταί (*IC* IV 72 col. xii.7, Gortyn,
c. 450), and ὀρφοβῶται (*SEG* 39 §1008.6–7, Morgantina, third century). The
claim in the *Suda* (ο 652 = III 564.16–18 Adler) that the ὀρφανισταί were an
Athenian ἀρχή is probably based on our passage; Xenophon mentions an

Athenian ἀρχή of ὀρφανοφύλακες (*Por.* 2.7), probably referring to the archon and his assistants (πάρεδροι), not a separate office (thus Jansen (2007) 293 n. 40). Could this technical term have a bureaucratic, loveless ring to it, matching the grim prospects which Tecmessa portrays? It is not certainly attested for Athens itself, but Athenian officers in charge of ephebes called σωφρονισταί are attested in the fourth century (see Hornblower on Thuc. 6.87.3).

514–19 Tecmessa emphasises that Ajax alone is her protector. This recalls *Il.* 6.409–30, where Andromache tells Hector that after his death it would be better for her to die too: οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄλλη | ἔσται θαλπωρή, . . . | ἀλλ' ἄχε' οὐδέ μοί ἐστι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ (411–13). She then describes how Achilles sacked her city of Thebe and killed her father Eëtion and her seven brothers; her mother was ransomed, and died peacefully in her father's house through the intervention of Artemis. As a result, she tells her spouse, Ἔκτορ, ἅτ' αὖρ σύ μοι ἐσσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ | ἥδ' ἐκ κασίγνητος, σύ δέ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης (429–30). Tecmessa's relationship with Ajax is more complicated because he sacked her city; but she emphasises that he was not responsible for the deaths of her parents (515–17n.).

514–15 ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκέτ' ἔστιν εἰς ὃ τι βλέπω | πλὴν σοῦ. 'Since for me there is no longer anything to which I can look for help apart from you.' For βλέπω ἐς in this sense see *El.* 954n.

515–17 σὺ γάρ μοι πατρίδ' ἥστωσας δορί, | καὶ μητέρ' ἄλλη μοῖρα τὸν φύσαντά τε | καθεῖλεν Ἄιδου θανάσιμους οἰκήτορας. 'For you razed my fatherland with the spear, and another fate laid low my mother and the man who begot me, to be dwellers of Hades.' Possessive μοι (Moorhouse 83–4) is more idiomatic and better attested than the variant μου. For the choice of δορί over δόρει see Finglass (2009g) 215–16. αἰστώω suggests violent destruction: cf. *Ti.* 881 αὐτὴν διηίστωσεν (of Deianira's suicide), Hom. *Od.* 20.79 (Penelope, praying for annihilation), [Aesch.] *PV* 152 with Griffith. The original sense 'makes unseen' might have been perceptible, in which case the verb balances Ἄιδου with its similar etymology.

The minority readings ἄλλη (*coni.* Porson (pre-1808b) 220) and τε (*coni.* Bothe¹) are superior to the alternative ἄλλ' ἢ . . . με, for three reasons. (i) The majority text, according to which Ajax destroys Tecmessa's homeland and her mother, while fate disposes of her father, is rhetorically ruinous: Tecmessa can hardly appeal for Ajax's help by reminding him of such a deed. Tecmessa's mother is an especially abhorrent victim, since a father, at least, could be killed honourably in battle. (In the *Iliad* Briseis had husband and three brothers killed by Achilles when he sacked her city (19.291–6), yet the concubine seems on good terms with her new master (1.348, 19.295–300).) Much later, probably in the fourth century AD, Dictys Cretensis 2.18 attributes the death of Tecmessa's

father to Ajax. (ii) The plural θανασίμους οικήτορας must be predicated of Tecmessa's father and mother, not her father alone. (iii) The article in ἡ μοῖρα is odd in tragic Greek.

Rather, ἄλλη stresses that Ajax is innocent of the deaths (cf. Fraenkel (1977) 15); emendations, such as αἰνή (Herwerden (1862) 112), ὦμή (Nauck (1859–62) II 89 n. 1), or the others listed by Dawe, *STS* I 142 (where ἀμήν should be attributed to Hermann?) obscure that point. So too does any attempt to give ἄλλη a sinister sense (cf. Bergk (1868) 375, Young (1966) 249); this meaning is established for ἄλλος (cf. West on Hes. *Op.* 344), but not in tragedy (Aesch. *Suppl.* 638 is textually uncertain).

For οικήτωρ of a dweller in Hades see 396–397/8n. For predicative θανασίμους οικήτορας see 239–42n.

518–19 τίς δῆτ' ἐμοὶ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀντὶ σοῦ πατρίς; | τίς πλοῦτος; ἐν σοὶ πᾶσ' ἔγωγε σῶζομαι. 'So what fatherland could there be for me apart from you? What wealth? My welfare wholly depends on you.' Tecmessa implies that (i) no homeland could be as good as Ajax, and (ii) since Ajax has taken away Tecmessa's homeland, he is morally obliged to provide her with a substitute (that is, himself). Cf. Homer as cited in 514–19n., Xen. *An.* 1.3.6 νομίζω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἐμοὶ εἶναι καὶ πατρίδα καὶ φίλους καὶ συμμάχους, *El.* 1148n.

For δῆτα in questions see 42n. The reference to πλοῦτος is not materialistic, but an acknowledgement of an aspect of her lost status (487–8; cf. *El.* 72n.). For ἐν σοὶ cf. Lys. 26.9 ἐν τῷ ἕκαστον δικαίως ἄρχειν ἢ τε πολιτεία καὶ τὸ ἄλλο πληθὺς τὸ ὑμέτερον σῶζεται, Garvie on Aesch. *Pers.* 172. Several manuscripts have πᾶσιν, and even those which read πᾶσ' often have –iv above the line (e.g. KA). Stephanus (1568) 12 sees that πᾶσα is preferable, since the iota of πᾶσι cannot be elided in tragedy. For γε following a pronoun without emphasis cf. 529, Denniston 122–3.

520–2 Tecmessa's final appeal is 'skilfully directed to a man who is burning under a sense of his own unrequited benefactions to the Greeks' (Stanford); cf. Achilles' decision to persist in his anger against the Greeks, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρα τις χάρις ἦεν | μάρνασθαι δῆοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι νωλεμὲς αἰεὶ (Hom. *Il.* 9.316–17), and Belfiore (1998) on breaches of reciprocity in tragedy. For the association of μνήμη and χάρις cf. Hes. *Th.* 503 ἀπεμνήσαντο χάριν εὐεργεσιῶν with West, Theogn. 112 μνήμα δ' ἔχουσ' ἀγαθῶν καὶ χάριν ἐξοπίσω; contrast 1266–9, 1354, Cic. *Off.* 2.63 *omnes enim immemorem benefici oderunt*. For the connexion between the two cf. Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 26.4 (pp. 471–2), to which JD adds Dem. 1.11, Posid. fr. 127.6 A–B ἀείμνηστον . . . χάριν, Meleager *A.P.* 4.1.4 = 3929 *HE* νυμαμόσυνον ταύταν ξεπτόνησε χάριν. For χάρις with πάσχω cf. Ant. Thess. *A.P.* 9.92.3–4 = 83–4 *GP* αἰοιδὸς ἀνήρ ξενίων χάριν ἀνταποδοῦναι | ὕμνους εὐέρκταις οἶδε παθῶν ὀλίγα.

520 ἀλλ' ἴσχε κάμου μνηστίν· 'But have some thought for me too'. For ἀλλά introducing an imperative see n. on 194a. The periphrasis μνηστίν ἴσχω (11–13n.) implies 'favourable recognition' (Pearson (1923) 28, comparing 1269, *El.* 392). καί means in addition to Ajax's parents and son; by concluding with an appeal to her own relationship with Ajax, she asserts the importance of that connexion to them both.

520–1 ἀνδρί τοι χρεών | μνήμην προσεῖναι, τερπνὸν εἴ τί που πάθοι. 'A man ought to remember, if he experiences something pleasurable.' The appeal to sexual remembrance features as a climactic argument in a paraenetic context at Eur. *Hec.* 828–30 (Hecuba to Agamemnon) ποῦ τὰς φίλας δῆτ' εὐφρόνας λέξεις [Diggle: δειξεις codd.], ἄναξ; | ἥ τῶν ἐν εὐνῇ φιλτάτων ἀσπασμάτων | χάριν τιν' ἔξει παῖς ἐμή, κείνης δ' ἐγώ; and Virg. *Aen.* 4.316–18 (Dido to Aeneas) *per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos, | si bene quid de te merui, fuit aut tibi quicquam | dulce meum, miserere* etc.; see further Scodel (1998). For proverbial τοι see 455–6n. τι and που soften the startlingly frank reference to sexual activity.

At the end of 521 manuscripts are divided between πάθοι (the majority) and πάθη. A generalising statement in primary sequence normally takes the subjunctive in its subordinate clause: cf. *Ant.* 710–11 ἀλλ' ἄνδρα, κεί τις ἦ σοφός, τὸ μανθάνειν | πόλλ' αἰσχρὸν οὐδὲν καὶ τὸ μὴ τείνειν ἄγαν (κῆν in AUy shows interpolation of ἄν), Aesch. *Eum.* 233–4 δεινὴ γὰρ ἐν βροτοῖσι κὰν θεοῖς πέλει | τοῦ προστροπαίου μῆνις, εἰ προδῶ σφ' ἐκόν, both of which have a metrically guaranteed subjunctive without ἄν after εἰ (cf. K–G II 474 Anm. 1). But the optative is also found, as in the following metrically guaranteed cases: *OR* 315, 979 εἰκὴ κράτιστον ζῆν, ὅπως δύναιτό τις, *Ant.* 666 ἀλλ' ὄν πόλις στήσσει, τοῦδε χρή κλύειν [*del.* Dawe], *Ti.* 92–3 καὶ γὰρ ὑστέρω, τό γ' εὖ | πρᾶσσειν ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο, κέρδος ἐμπολᾶ (cf. Jones (1910) 118). There are also examples in prose (see K–G I 252–3, Goodwin §555). In other places metre allows either: manuscripts present an optative at *Aj.* 1344, and are split at *Ant.* 1032 and *OR* 917. We may as well print the better attested reading in each case. The optative probably arises from a feeling that this mood is more appropriate to a generalised statement (cf. Moorhouse 282). As regards sense, it is hard to see a nuance different from the subjunctive.

522 χάρις χάριν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τίκτους' ἀεί. 'For it is always one kindness that begets another' (Lloyd-Jones). χάρις is a key word in the vocabulary of reciprocity (cf. R. Parker (1998) 108–9), but can also have a specifically erotic edge (cf. fr. 339 *TrGF* (from *Colchides*; presumably Medea to Jason) ἡ φῆς ὑπομνὺς ἀνθυπουργῆσαι χάριν; , Theogn. 1321, 1331, 1367, 1372). For polyptoton in the context of reciprocal giving cf. *OC* 779... ὅτ' οὐδὲν ἡ χάρις χάριν φέροι, *Ti.* 494–5 ἅ τ' ἀντὶ δώρων δῶρα χρή προσαρμόσαι, | καὶ ταῦτ' ἄγης, Eur. *Hel.* 1234 χάρις γὰρ ἀντὶ χάριτος ἐλθέτω, Gygli-Wyss (1966) 86. γὰρ after two nouns in polyptoton occurs at [Aesch.] *PV* 29 θεὸς θεῶν γὰρ οὐχ

ὑποπτήσσω χόλον, Eur. *Trö.* 621 κακῶ κακὸν γὰρ εἰς ἄμιλλαν ἔρχεται; the stylish juxtaposition overrides the tendency of the particle to occupy second place. For τίκτω in polyptoton cf. Zenob. 3.328 Δίκη δίκην ἔτικτε καὶ βλάβη βλάβην; the variant φύουσ’ may have originated as a gloss (28n.).

523–4 οὔτου δ’ ἄπορρεῖ μνήστις εὖ πεπονθότος, | οὐκ ἂν γένοιτ’ ἔθ’ οὗτος εὐγενὴς ἀνὴρ. ‘But when a man’s memory of the benefits which he has received flows away, this man could no longer be noble.’ For ἄπορρεῖ in this context cf. 1267 (διαρρεῖ), *El.* 1000n. For γένοιτο cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 447–8 πῶς οὖν ἔτ’ ἂν γένοιτ’ ἂν ἰσχυρὰ πόλις | ὅταν τις κτλ., which defends the paradosis against λέγοιτ’ (Tournier (1882) 115; for the error see J. Jackson (1955) 42, adding Eur. *Alc.* 153), and supports ἔθ’ against the variants ποθ’ and ἄν (ἔθ’ also causes problems at 756 and 778).

525–6 Αἶας, ἔχειν σ’ ἂν οἶκτον ὡς κἀγὼ φρενὶ | θέλοιμ’ ἄν. ‘Ajax, I would wish that you too had pity in your mind, as I do.’ The optative of a verb of wishing followed by an infinitive, a polite substitute for an imperative, reflects the magnitude of the request: pity is not Ajax’s emotion of choice (cf. 580). For οἶκτον ἔχειν cf. Tr. *Adesp.* fr. 640b.11 *TrGF* (v/2 p. 1132) οἶκτ[ον] λαβεῖν, 11–13n., *El.* 523n. Greek attaches καὶ to a subordinate expression when English puts its equivalent in the main clause (compare the positions of καὶ and ‘too’ above): cf. *OC* 53 ὅσ’ οἶδα κἀγὼ πάντ’ ἐπιστήσῃ κλυῶν with Jebb, Denniston 295–6. For powerful feelings in the φρήν cf. *El.* 809–10, Solmsen (1984) 268 with n. 17; for locative φρενὶ cf. 585, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 606.

526 αἰνοίης γὰρ ἂν τὰ τῆσδ’ ἔπη. ‘For if you did, you would approve her words.’ Politeness causes the indirect syntax (optative plus ἄν in the apodosis to an implied conditional, rather than a simple imperative) and semantics (‘approve her words’, rather than ‘do as she says’). For the ellipse (of εἰ ἔχοις) with γάρ cf. *El.* 527n.

527–8 καὶ κάρτ’ ἐπαίνου τεύζεται πρὸς γοῦν ἑμοῦ, | ἔαν μόνον τὸ ταχθὲν εὖ τολμᾷ τελεῖν. ‘Approval indeed she will get, from me, at any rate, if she can only bring herself to fulfil her orders.’ Picking up on the chorus’s αἰνοίης, and ignoring their reference to pity (cf. 580), Ajax makes his praise conditional not on Tecmessa’s past words, but her future actions. His direct language contrasts with the chorus’s optatives; he has no need of convoluted speech to effect his wishes. If she obeys him, she will obtain his approval, whether or not anyone else commends her actions; the latter is a matter of indifference to him (hence limitative πρὸς γοῦν ἑμοῦ). (Dawe, *STS* 1 143, objects that since the chorus feel pity for Tecmessa, Ajax ‘cannot possibly reply that he *at least* will approve of her words or conduct’; but the chorus refer to the present, Ajax to the future.)

εὖ τολμᾷ and τὸ ταχθέν have a military ring, while for τελεῖν (a stronger alternative to ποιεῖν: *El.* 947n.) denoting the execution of a command cf. *OR* 252, Diggle (1996a) 5. Ignoring her closing appeals to their personal relationship, Ajax addresses his concubine like a subordinate soldier. Alliteration of tau and theta recurs at 687–8 when Ajax gives instructions to the chorus: we cannot tell if the effect was as harsh to an ancient audience as it can seem to us. (On the latter passage Winnington-Ingram (1980) 53 sees ‘the suppressed passion of Ajax surging beneath the words of outward resignation’; I wonder.)

529 ἀλλ’, ὦ φίλ’ Αἴας, πάντ’ ἔγωγε πείσομαι. ‘Dear Ajax, I shall obey in every way.’ Tecmessa eagerly makes contact with Ajax, who has not yet addressed her, and promises her obedience without knowing his request. Cf. Pacuvius fr. 30 Ribbeck ≈ 26 Schierl (*Armorum Iudicium*) *dic quid faciam: quod me moneris, effectum da<bo>* (possibly influenced by our line: thus Lobeck² 3). ‘Assentient’ ἀλλά ‘introduces the substantiation by the second speaker of an hypothesis or wish expressed by the first’ (Denniston 20). For ἔγωγε see 518–19n.

530 κόμιζε νύν μοι παῖδα τὸν ἐμόν, ὥς ἴδω. ‘Then bring me my child, so I can see him.’

531 καὶ μὴν φόβοισι γ’ αὐτὸν ἐξελυσάμην. ‘And yet it was in my fear that I had him let out.’ καὶ μὴν in this sense (Denniston 357–8) is often accompanied by emphatic γε in S. (Jebb lists instances). For the dative of cause see 177–8n. Instead of φόβοισι γ’ a few manuscripts have φόβοισιν, losing γε, as happens in this combination (καὶ μὴν . . . γε) in some manuscripts at *OR* 836, *Ant.* 221, and in all at *OR* 987 (where metre exposes the error). φόβῳ σοῦ γ’ (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 3) and φόβῳ σῶ γ’ (*coni.* Blaydes¹) specify the object of Tecmessa’s fear: ‘but how much better is the transmitted text for being less explicit!’ (Ll-J/W, *So.*). φόβῳ σῖγ’ (*coni.* Broadhead (1961) 53) removes γε to introduce an unnecessary reference to silence.

ἐξελυσάμην is emended to ἐξερρυσάμην (‘rescued’) by Hermann³, who points to the scholium ῥύσασθαι θέλουσα ἐξήγαγον (p. 130 Chr.); the reverse error occurs in some manuscripts at [Aesch.] *PV* 235. Jebb vindicates the paradox as an example of tactful reticence on the part of the speaker: ἐξερρυσάμην, unlike ἐξελυσάμην, would emphasise the presence of a threat. (Pierson (pre-1759) 196 verso writes ἐξερρυσάμην. No metrically secure instance in tragedy reveals whether the rho was single or double; the attested forms are ἐρρ– at *Ion* 1298, *IA* 1155, fr. 190 *TrGF*, εἶρυ– at *Cycl.* 291, and ἐρυ– at *Ion* 1565, while at *Eur. Alc.* 11 manuscripts offer ἐρρ– and ἐρυ–.)

532 ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς κακοῖσιν, ἦ τί μοι λέγεις; ‘In the midst of these troubles, or what are you telling me?’ With ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς (cf. 1118, 1151, *El.* 308n.) Ajax makes more explicit the nature of Tecmessa’s fear; he has no time for euphemism.

533 μή σοί γέ που δύστηνος ἀντήσας θάνοι. ‘Yes, in case the wretched boy encountered you and was killed.’ Prompted by Ajax’s directness, Tecmessa is more explicit even than he.

534 πρέπον γέ τᾶν ἦν δαίμονος τοῦμοῦ τόδε. ‘That at any rate would have been worthy of my fortune.’ Cf. Heracles and Agaue in Euripides’ *Heracles* and *Bacchae*, both of whom undertake a perverted ‘hunt’ for vengeance against their enemies, which culminates in the ‘hunters’ killing their own children (Seaford (1989) 94–5 with n. 37). πρέπον takes the genitive (instead of the usual dative) on the model of ἄξιον (thus Schneidewin): cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 458 τὰχ’ ἄν [Marckscheffel: τύχαν cod.] γυναικῶν ταῦτα συμπρεπῆ πέλοι, Pl. *Resp.* 400b, *Men.* 239c, and πρόσφορος at Eur. *Hel.* 508–9 τὰ πρόσφορα | τῆς νῦν παρούσης συμφορᾶς αἰτήσομαι [*del.* Willink], perhaps Aesch. *Cho.* 711 μακρᾶς κελεύθου τυγχάνειν τὰ πρόσφορα (see Garvie). For γε τοι see Denniston 550 (‘a livelier form of the much commoner γοῦν’), Collard (2005a) 374. For the orthography of τᾶν see 455–6n.

J. Jackson (1955) 44, followed by Ll-J/W, punctuates after ἦν, but ‘Ajax would . . . not say of killing his son that it would have been πρέπον without something in the same clause to limit the meaning of the word’ (West (1978a) 110; the same objection applies, as West notes, to τ’ ἐμοῦ, *coni.* Blaydes’). Ll-J/W (*So.*) counter that ‘Ajax is not incapable of grim irony’, waving what Fraenkel (on Aesch. *Ag.* 1523–4) calls ‘the magic wand of irony, by which the commentator converts the sense of a sentence into the exact opposite of what, to the ordinary man, it seems to say’. Contextual problems aside, the sense ‘it would have been fitting: this is characteristic of my fortune’ is awkward, and the asyndeton out of place (cf. Dawe (1968) 10). West’s suggestion of τρόπου for πρέπον is unnecessary if we accept that the latter can govern a genitive.

535 ἀλλ’ οὖν ἐγὼ φύλαξα τοῦτό γ’ ἀρκέσαι. ‘Well anyway, I took precautions to prevent that.’ For ἀλλ’ οὖν ‘approaching δ’ οὖν or ἀλλὰ γάρ in sense, signifying an elimination of the secondary or irrelevant, a break-off in thought, a resumption of the main issue’ see Denniston 443; in our passage he identifies the sense as ‘Well, anyhow, whether πρέπον or not, I stopped *that* happening.’ The aphaeresis in φύλαξα, restored by Bentley (pre-1742) 245, has been found in a couple of manuscripts. For φυλάσσω governing an infinitive cf. fr. 472.2–3 *TrGF* δισσὰ γὰρ φυλάσσεται, | φίλων τε μέμψιν κείς θεοὺς ἀμαρτάνειν and (middle) Aesch. *Suppl.* 205–6, Hes. *Op.* 797–9.

536 ἐπήνεσ’ ἔργον καὶ πρόνοιαν ἦν ἔθου. ‘I approve your action and the foresight which you took.’ Ajax does at least acknowledge the rescue of his son, but his tone ‘is stiffly formal, in marked contrast to Tecmessa’s more directly emotional language’ (M. Lloyd (1999) 39). Lloyd’s additional claim, that the tense distances Ajax from the acknowledgement, gives the instantaneous aorist

an unlikely sense (*El.* 668n.). For Ajax's own πρόνοια see 119–20n. For the periphrasis πρόνοιαν . . . ἔθου see 11–13n.

537 τί δῆτ' ἂν ὥς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἂν ὠφελοῖμί σε; 'How then could I help you as things stand now?' Cf. *Ant.* 552 τί δῆτ' ἂν ἀλλὰ νῦν σ' ἔτ' ὠφελοῖμί' ἐγώ; For δῆτα in questions see 42n. For ἐκ τῶνδε referring to the present situation cf. *Tk.* 1109 χειρώσομαι κάκ τῶνδε, *Eur. Med.* 459, *Andr.* 1184 ὥς ἐκ τῶνδε, *Thuc.* 4.17.1 ὥς ἐκ τῶν παρόντων, Bruhn §68.iii, Diggle (1973) 249 = (1994) 67–8. ὥς is limitative (394a–395n.): Tecmessa has helped Ajax before, but how can she do so now? Van Eldik's δῆτα δρώσ' (*ap.* Brunck), for which cf. *Eur. IA* 1453 ἔσθ' ὅτι κατ' Ἄργος δρώσά σοι χάριν φέρω;, removes this nuance.

538 δός μοι προσειπεῖν αὐτόν ἐμφανῆ τ' ἰδεῖν. 'Let me speak to him and see him face to face.'

539 καὶ μὴν πέλας γε προσπόλοις φυλάσσεται. 'Yes, you will be able to see him, since he is near by, in the care of the attendants.' For καὶ μὴν 'in dialogue, expressing, directly or by implication, agreement or consent, or a generally favourable reaction to the words of the previous speaker' (Denniston 353) cf. 990. κομίζεται in P shows the substitution of a word of similar shape (56–8n.), which itself occurs at 544; it may be an emendation aimed at making Tecmessa prompter in her obedience.

540 τί δῆτα μέλλει μὴ οὐ παρουσίαν ἔχειν; 'Why then is his coming delayed?' For τί δῆτα followed by μέλλω introducing an impatient question cf. [*Aesch.*] *PV* 627 τί δῆτα μέλλεις μὴ οὐ γεγωνίσκειν τὸ πᾶν;., *S. Ant.* 499, *Eur. Hdd.* 1045, *Or.* 275, *Ba.* 1351, *Thrasym.* D–K 85 B 1 (π 323.8–9). For δῆτα in questions see 42n. For the omission of οὐ in some manuscripts see 96n. παρουσίαν ἔχειν is an elaborate periphrasis for παρῆναι (11–13n., Long (1968) 106).

541–5 Eurysaces begins his entry from eisodos A, brought by an attendant. Although Ajax requests his presence as early as 530, Tecmessa only calls for him at 541. He is still out of (Ajax's) sight at 543; by 544 Tecmessa can see him, and at 545 Ajax asks for him to be lifted into his arms. Of the possible locations for his entry, we can rule out the skene door, 'since Tecmessa has sent him away from Ajax's hut as a precaution' (H/OK (2007) 368), and eisodos B, as 'it would be strange to send the child into the wilderness beyond the camp for safety' (*ibid.*). This leaves eisodos A (*prob.* M. Heath (1987) 183 n. 32), which leads to the rest of the Greek camp; the section of that camp immediately adjacent to Ajax's hut will have been occupied by his followers (H/OK p. 365; the chorus make their entry via that eisodos at 134), and so an obvious place to stow the child.

H/OK (2007) 368 object to the use of the eisodos on the ground that it 'would need more cover than the two lines between the summons in 541–2

and the arrival at 544'. We obtain a gap of four lines if we assume that Eurysaces begins to make his way at 541, and arrives in 545; compare the prologue of *OC*, where the demesman of Colonus is seen approaching from an *eisodos* at 28 and has arrived by 31 (for other passages covering such an entrance see *El.* 1428n.). Moreover, Ajax's words at 543 are consistent with a pause while the boy approaches, probably between 542 and 543. H/OK posit an extra door in the skene, representing the entrance to a separate hut (see their n. 19 for scholars with a similar approach). But more than one door is dubious for tragedy (Introduction p. 19).

541–2 ὦ παῖ, πατήρ καλεῖ σε. δεῦρο προσπόλων | ἄγ' αὐτόν ὅσπερ χερσὶν εὐθύνων κυρεῖς. 'My child, your father is calling you. Come, bring him here, whichever of you servants is guiding his steps.' The translation of χερσὶν εὐθύνων is owed to Jebb; the expression indicates that he is being led by the hand, but not carried (so correctly H/OK (2007) 368). Contrast the (prefixed) verb described in 71–2n., 1067–9n.

543 ἔρποντι φωνεῖς, ἢ λελειμμένῳ λόγου; 'Do you speak to a man on the move, or one ignoring your request?' For phrases of the type ἔρποντι φωνεῖς see *El.* 853n., adding Eur. *Held.* 693 as emended by Diggle (though note Collard (1986) 21 = (2007) 184–5). The issue at stake in λελειμμένῳ λόγου is obedience (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1246 λέλειμμαι τῶν ἐν Ἑλλήσιν νόμων), not audibility. λόγου is preferable to the variant λόγων because the referent is a discrete order (thus Fraenkel (1983) 441 = (2007a) 49).

544 καὶ δὴ κομίζει προσπόλων δδ' ἐγγύθεν. 'Look, one of the attendants is bringing him from nearby.' καὶ δὴ introduces a new arrival (cf. Denniston 251).

545–82 Ajax's first speech was a soliloquy concerned with his own plight (430–80). His latest has a series of addressees, and shows a lively interest in others. After a brief instruction to an attendant (545), Ajax speaks of, and to, his son (545–64), the chorus (565–73), his son again (574–7), and finally Tecmessa (578–82). He makes arrangements for the well-being of his γένος after his death: Teucer will provide τροφή to Eurysaces (560–4), who in turn will look after his grandparents (567–70). To that extent, Tecmessa's speech has succeeded in reminding Ajax of his wider obligations, although it scarcely seems a victory; after all, she has failed in her main purpose, which was to dissuade Ajax from suicide. The practicalities of Ajax's arrangements are also troubling. He gives no indication of how Teucer will protect Eurysaces from a hostile army; in the short term, he will not even be present. And Eurysaces is patently not old enough to take responsibility for Ajax's aged parents. Of Tecmessa herself, and her fate, Ajax says nothing; his concluding address to her ('shut up and close the door') lacks the respect, even affection, with which he speaks to Eurysaces and the chorus.

Ajax's encounter with his son is modelled on Hector's with Astyanax in *Iliad* 6. The comparison is not to Ajax's advantage (545–7n., 550–1n.): 'in place of gentleness, soft tears and laughter, parental warmth, chivalrous considerateness, there is harshness, peremptory disregard of feelings, fierce stubbornness, and bitter despair' (Kirkwood (1965) 59; cf. Pratt (2007) 28 n. 15). Yet interwoven with this fierceness is a strain of lyrical contemplation (552–5, 558–9), as Ajax imagines the blessed state of youthful ignorance (cf. Perrotta (1935) 146, Winnington-Ingram (1980) 31). Eurysaces will abandon that condition on reaching maturity, when he will protect Ajax's parents (567–70) and confront his enemies (556–7). Ajax's course, on the other hand, is in the opposite direction: since his life is dominated by τὸ λυπεῖσθαι at the expense of τὸ χαίρειν (555), he will cut it short, and return to an enviable state of insensate bliss. Tecmessa has already described the advantages of that condition with regard to Ajax himself (265–77); ironically, given Ajax's contempt for her in this scene, she anticipates his insight (Hesk (2003) 54–5).

The suicide is apparently imminent; the elaborate nature of his plans, right down to the division of his armour (572–7), leaves no room for doubt. Ajax expects to be dead by the time Teucer returns, or else he would not tell the chorus what to say to him (565–73). His closing *gnome*, too, implies that the death blow will follow shortly.

545 αἶρ' αὐτόν, αἶρε δεῦρο. 'Lift him, lift him here.' Cf. Aesch. fr. 47a.802–4 *TrGF* (the chorus of satyrs to the baby Perseus) ὦ φίντων, ἴθι δε[ῦρο.] | θάρσει δῆ· τί κινύρη[ι]; The scholia (p. 132 Chr.) interpret αἶρε as πρόσφερε, citing Hom. *Il.* 6.264 μή μοι οἶνον ἄειρε μελίφρονα (cf. A/O on *Ae. Thesm.* 255), but since the boy must be lifted into Ajax's arms, it is easier to understand the regular sense. Ajax can set him down, still touching him, on the floor of the ekkyklema so that he does not have to deliver the speech while carrying him. Kaimio (1988) 42–8 examines other passages in tragedy where physical contact marks an emotional farewell.

545–7 ταρβήσει γὰρ οὐ, | νεοσφαγῇ †τουτονδε† προσλεύσσω φόνον, | εἶπερ δικαίως ἔστ' ἐμὸς τὰ πατρόθεν. 'For he will not flinch as he looks upon [this] newly-spilt blood, if truly he has me as his father.' In the *Iliad* Astyanax shrinks from his father's embrace, πατὴρ φίλου ὄψιν ἄτυχθεις, | ταρβήσας χαλκὸν τε ἰδὲ λόφον ἱππιοχαίτην, | δεινὸν ἅπ' ἀκροτάτης κόρυθος νεύοντα νοήσας (6.468–70). This provokes laughter from his parents, and Hector removes his helmet before picking him up. Such tenderness is foreign to Ajax's view of human relationships. Forbidding fear in the face of blood recalls Ajax's previous ban on noisy lamentation (317–22n.).

οὐ qualifies the verb despite coming after it: cf. *Ant.* 255, *El.* 905, *Phil.* 545. For νεοσφαγῇ . . . φόνον cf. Eur. *El.* 1172–3 νεοφόνους ἐν αἵμασιν | πεφυρμένοι. For the orthography of λεύσσω see 259–62n.

Fraenkel (1967a) 83–4 best analyses the textual problem following νεοσφαγή. The mediaeval paradosis, ΤΟΥΤΟΝΔΕ, gave the nonsensical readings τοῦ τόνδε (L) and τοῦτον δέ (K). These were emended to που τόνδε (A, perhaps via ποῦ τόνδε as in Zc; for confusion between που and τοῦ cf. fr. 522.1 *TrGF*, *Ti*. 908) and τοῦτόν γε (above the line in K, and in the text of many later manuscripts). Each of these introduces a problematic particle, which indicates their secondary origin. Word order demands that που accompany νεοσφαγή . . . προσλεύσσω φόνον, not ταρβήσει (thus correctly Kamerbeek), yet sense requires the reverse; while the force of γε is obscure (this as opposed to what?).

The best emendations are τοιόνδε (Mekler *ap.* Dindorf⁶ p. xii), adopted by Fraenkel, which would mean ‘such’, as at 453, and μου τόνδε (Morstadt (1864) 44). Dawe³ prints μὴ οὐ τόνδε προσλεύσσειν (‘he will not shrink from looking at this recent bloodshed’; cf. (1998) 119–20), assuming still deeper corruption. Dindorf (1836) 305 suggests deleting 546, but the reference to gore explains ταρβήσει.

Inheritance of paternal characteristics (cf. Eur. fr. 75.2–3 *TrGF* ἐσθλῶν ἀπ’ ἀνδρῶν ἐσθλὰ γίγνεσθαι τέκνα, | κακῶν δ’ ὅμοια τῇ φύσει τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς with Kannicht) indicates a child’s legitimacy (West on Hes. *Op.* 235, Gow on Theocr. 17.44). εἰ approximates to ‘since’ (*El.* 1425n.), as at Hom. *Od.* 16.300 εἰ ἐτέον γ’ ἐμός ἐσσι καὶ αἵματος ἡμετέροιο, Bacchyl. 17.52–4 μεγαλοσθενές | Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἄκουσον· εἴπερ με νύμ[φ]α | Φοίνισσα λευκώλενος σοὶ τέκεν κτλ., Eur. *Hcl.* 562–3 σφαγῆς γε πρὸς τὸ δεινὸν εἴμ’ ἐγώ, | εἴπερ πέφυκα πατρὸς οὐπὲρ εὐχόμαι, fr. 223.2–3 *TrGF* (*suppl.*). Sometimes in similar expressions εἰ is a true ‘if’ (cf. S. fr. 86, Eur. fr. 773.6–7), but here the resulting insult to Tecmessa would be gratuitous. Either nuance can be accompanied by περ (Denniston 487–8).

δικαίως approximates to ὀρθῶς: cf. *OR* 852–3 οὗτοι ποτ’, ὦναξ, τόν γε Λαῖον φόνον | φανεῖ δικαίως ὀρθόν, *Ti.* 346–7 ἀνὴρ ὃδ’ οὐδὲν ὦν ἔλεξεν ἀρτίως | φωνεῖ δίκης ἐς ὀρθόν, Aesch. *Sept.* 405 ὀρθῶς ἐνδίκως τ’ ἐπώνυμον, Eur. *Hel.* 280–1 with Kannicht, Priscian *Inst.* 18.206 (III 308.18–309.1 *GL*) ‘iustum’ *pro vero et verum’ pro iusto frequenter tam nos quam Attici ponimus.* Sophocles Αἴαντι: ‘δικαίος γόνος’ *pro verus*’ (= fr. dub. 1119 *TrGF*, but probably just a reference to our passage), Griffith (1978) 85. Greek δίκη often goes beyond English ‘justice’ to mean ‘the established order of things’ (cf. the sense ‘custom, way’ at e.g. Hom. *Od.* 4.691 ἦ τ’ ἐστὶ δίκη θεῶν βασιλῆων with S. West): fearlessness is, for Ajax, a basic characteristic of his family (cf. H. Fränkel (1930) 166–7 = (1968) 170–1). For τὰ πατρόθεν cf. *Ti.* Adesp. fr. 655.13 *TrGF* τὰ μητρὸς θεν, Lejeune (1939) 152–5 (examples in prose and poetry).

548–9 ἀλλ’ αὐτίκ’ ὠμοῖς αὐτόν ἐν νόμοις πατρὸς | δεῖ πωλοδαμνεῖν κάξο-μοιοῦσθαι φύσιν. ‘No, straight away he must be broken in, like a foal, in the

harsh ways of his father, and assimilated to him in his nature.’ The often violent process of taming a horse can be used metaphorically of human relationships involving domination (Griffith on *Ant.* 477–8): brutality is to be the hallmark of Eurysaces’ education. In contrast to Hector, who wants his son to be a great warrior when he grows up, Ajax wants his offspring to be inculcated into his violent ways immediately (αὐτίκα; thus Hesk (2003) 70). Qualifying νόμος (redolent of civilisation) with ὤμος (suggesting primitive savagery) is ‘something of an oxymoron’ (Goldhill (1986) 187); with frank self-awareness, Ajax in effect predicates the adjective of himself (cf. 205–7n.). αὐτόν, the object of the first infinitive, becomes subject of the second (cf. Eur. *Held.* 101–3, *Cycl.* 299–303). πωλοδοαμνεῖν appears elsewhere in classical Greek at [Eur.] *Rhes.* 187, 624, and several times in Xenophon; for denominative verbs from compound nouns treated as simple transitive verbs see *El.* 190n., adding Wifstrand (1946) 244–5. For πῶλος of a young man cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 794, Eur. *Phoen.* 947, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 386–7; also [Lucian] 49.45 τὴν νεότητα πωλοδοαμνήσας ἐν εἰρήνῃ μελετᾷ τὰ πολεμικά.

550–1 ὦ παῖ, γένοιο πατρός εὐτυχέστερος, | τὰ δ’ ἄλλ’ ὅμοιος· καὶ γένοι’ ἂν οὐ κακός. ‘My son, may you be more fortunate than your father, but in all other respects the same. And you would be no coward.’ After kissing and dandling his son in his arms, Hector prays as follows (6.476–81): Ζεῦ ἄλλοι τε θεοί, δότε δὴ καὶ τόνδε γενέσθαι | παῖδ’ ἐμόν, ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ περ, ἀριπρεπέα Τρώεσσιν | ὥδε βίην τ’ ἀγαθόν, καὶ Ἰλίου Ἴφι ἀνάσσειν. | καὶ ποτέ τις εἴποι “πατρός γ’ ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων” | ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιόντα, φέροι δ’ ἔναρα βροτόντα | κτείνας δῆιον ἄνδρα, χαρεῖη δὲ φρένα μήτηρ. The comparison is telling: ‘the one prays that his son may be better than he, the other that he may be his equal in everything but luck – a difference that speaks volumes of Ajax’s unbridled egotism’ (W. Brown (1965) 120).

According to March (1991–3) 16, ‘we should accept [Ajax’s words] simply at face value: Ajax is, quite literally, the best, so his son could not be better, and false modesty on Ajax’s part would be quite out of place’. But Ajax is not best, but second best (421–6n.). Even if he were best, it would not follow that no one could be better. Hector is mightiest of the Trojans, yet prays that his son may enjoy a still more glorious reputation. Even on its own terms, March’s argument works only if by ‘the best’ she means ‘the best that could possibly exist’. Does March really predicate this quality of Sophocles’ Ajax?

For the idea of being more successful than one’s father cf. Eur. fr. 448a.71–2 *TrGF* ≈ p. 113.43–4 *TrGFS* (Diggle’s text) Ζεῦ Ζεῦ, σὺ γ’ ἡμᾶς εὐτυχεστέρους πατρ[ός] | θές, *Lys.* 2.16 τοσοῦτον δὲ εὐτυχέστεροι παῖδες ὄντες ἐγένοντο τοῦ πατρός. For the heritability of bad fortune cf. Eur. *Her.* 133 τὸ δὲ κακοτυχές (*sc.* τοῦ Ἡρακλέους) οὐ λέλοιπεν ἐκ τέκνων.

Ajax's prayer is probably the model for the following, which are therefore not parallels in the strict sense of the term: Accius *Armorum Iudicium* 156 Ribbeck *virtuti sis par, dispar fortunae patris*, Virg. *Aen.* 12.435–6 *disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem, | fortunam ex aliis*, Dion. Hal. 8.41.3 (Coriolanus speaks) τὰ παιδία ταῦτα . . . τρέφετε . . . οἷς θεοὶ δοῖεν εἰς ἀνδρας ἐλθοῦσι τύχην μὲν κρείττονα τοῦ πατρός, ἀρετὴν δὲ μὴ χείρονα, Liban. *Decl.* 19.41 (vi 288.9–11 Foerster) θυγατρίδοὺς δὲ εἰ γένοιτο, τύχη μὲν, ὥ θεοί, διενέγκοι τοῦ πάππου, τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὁμοίως γένοιτο.

ὁμοίος, together with ἔρημος, ἑτοιμος, and γελοιος, is said by grammarians to have been properispomenon in 'older Attic' (as it was in the *Koine*) and proparoxytone in 'later Attic' (Vendryes's Law, which also explains Attic ἔγωγε, ἔμοιγε; references and analysis in Probert (2004) 283–5). Wackernagel (1914) 50 = (1953–79) II 1152 argues that what the grammarians call 'old Attic' is in fact the Homeric dialect. Since the manuscript L, which sometimes reflects ancient grammatical tradition (101n.), almost always has these words proparoxytone, grammarians may have regarded S. as part of 'later Attic' for this purpose. But a properispomenon accentuation remains possible; according to Probert (2003) 165, the shift probably takes place in the fourth century.

552–9 Young people can be represented as untouched by sufferings which afflict adults: cf. *Tr.* 144–9 (Deianira to the chorus of girls) τὸ γὰρ νεάζον . . . ἡδοναῖς ἄμοχθον ἐξαίρει βίον | ἐς τοῦθ', ἕως τις ἀντί παρθένου γυνὴ | κληθῆι, λάβη τ' ἐν νυκτὶ φροντίδων μέρος, *OC* 1229–1231/2 ὥς εὖτ' ἂν τὸ νέον παρῇ [*<παρίημι*, 'when it has departed': see Jebb] | κούφας ἀφροσύνας φέρον, | τίς πλάγα πολύμοχθος ἔξω; τίς οὐ καμάτῳ ἔνι;, *Tereus* fr. 583.3–7 *TrGF*, Eur. *Med.* 46–8 οἶδε παῖδες . . . | στείχουσι, μητρὸς οὐδὲν ἐννοοῦμενοι | κακῶν· νέα γὰρ φροντίς οὐκ ἀλγεῖν φιλεῖ, Mimnermus fr. 2.3–5 *IEG* with Gerber (1975) 266–8, Simon. fr. 271.7–9 Poltera (Danae to Perseus) with Hutchinson (on his line 8) and Kassel (1954) 24–5 = (1991) 20–1, Stat. *Theb.* 4.792–3. The Sophoclean examples are similarly expressed, with an 'until' (cf. 555 ἕως) or 'when' (556 ὅταν δ' ἴκη πρὸς τοῦτο) clause marking the moment of maturity. Ajax's madness earlier reduces him to a similarly innocent state (263–81n.); what is expressed there in closely-argued dialectic becomes here a moving description of the innocence of youth.

552–3 καίτοι σε καὶ νῦν τοῦτό γε ζηλοῦν ἔχω, | ὁθούνεκ' οὐδὲν τῶνδ' ἔπαισθήνη κακῶν. 'And yet even now I can envy this, at least, in you – that you perceive none of these misfortunes.' For καίτοι see 158–9n. Accusative τοῦτό γε with ζηλῶ replaces the expected genitive, as at fr. 584.1 *TrGF* πολλὰ σε ζηλῶ βίου; the construction is easier with a pronoun. For envy as a response to ignorance of misfortune cf. Eur. *Med.* 60.

554–5 ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἡδιστος βίος, | [τὸ μὴ φρονεῖν γὰρ κάρτ' ἀνώδυνον κακόν.] | ἕως τὸ χαίρειν καὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μάθης. ‘For life is sweetest when one understands nothing, [for lack of understanding is a most painless suffering,] until you experience joy and despair.’ For the thought see 263–81n. For φρονέω ‘realise, understand’ cf. 942, *OR* 1319–20 καὶ θαυμά γ’ οὐδὲν ἐν τοσοῖσδε πῆμασιν | διπλᾶ σε πευθεῖν καὶ διπλᾶ φρονεῖν [v.l. φορεῖν, φέρειν: θροεῖν Nauck] κακά, Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1401, Pearson on S. fr. 91, Moorhouse 306–7. For ἡδιστος in a generalisation cf. *OC* 434–5 ἡδιστον δέ μοι | τὸ καθανεῖν ἦν καὶ τὸ λευσθῆναι πέτροις, *Ant.* 1031–2, fr. 67.1 *TrGF* (with Renehan (1976) 56), fr. 583.4. For ἕως see 552–9n. χαίρειν ~ λυπεῖσθαι is a standard opposition: cf. Aesch. fr. 266.3 *TrGF*, Eur. *IA* [30–1], Astydamas II 60 F 5.2–3, Dem. 18.217, 18.292, Pl. *Gorg.* 498e, *Resp.* 583c, Arist. *EE* 1224b17.

554b is omitted from a citation of 550–5 by Stobaeus (4.24.54 = IV 618.8–13 W–H), and Wesseling (1751) 89 deletes it on that ground. Since Stobaeus is not reliable when it comes to omissions, we must be guided by the sense (thus Fraenkel (1983) 442, (2007a) 49). Wesseling anticipates Valckenaer on Eur. *Hipp.* 247, who argues that the line is by S. but not from this play, and entered the text after being written in the margin next to the preceding verse. This is a more plausible scenario than to suppose that S. wrote two lines in succession with similar meaning and expression; the marginal line need not, however, have been taken from a Sophoclean play. Of the pair, 554b, not 554, must go (*pace* Musgrave): ἡδιστος βίος, not ἀνώδυνον κακόν, provides the required description of the felicity of youth which explains Ajax’s envy and contrasts with the emotional turmoil of adulthood.

556–7 ὅταν δ’ ἴκη πρὸς τοῦτο, δεῖ σ’ ὅπως πατρός | δείξεις ἐν ἐχθροῖς οἶος ἐξ οἴου ἑράφης. ‘When you reach this stage, you must show amid your father’s enemies what a man you are, and from what stock you are sprung.’ For the ὅταν clause see 552–9n. δεῖ governs not an infinitive, but a clause which itself expresses obligation, thereby amplifying the force of the command (thus Moorhouse 308): cf. *Phil.* 54–5 τὴν Φιλοκτῆτος σε δεῖ | ψυχὴν ὅπως λόγιοισιν ἐκκλέψει λέγων, Cratinus fr. 115.1–2 *PCG* δεῖ σ’ ὅπως εὐσημῶνως | ἀλεκτρύνος μηδὲν διοίσεις τοὺς τρόπους. Kalén (1941) 28 argues that it was an everyday usage on the basis of the Cratinus passage, but the comic poet could be adopting a tragic idiom. The well-attested variant δείξης shows an easy corruption (cf. 569, 1040, *El.* 955–6 (n.), *Phil.* 55; perhaps 699/700), probably arising from the feeling that a subordinate clause ought to contain a subjunctive.

The polyptoton οἶος ἐξ οἴου (cf. 923–4n.) implies the heritability of greatness: cf. 1304, *Phil.* 874–5, Archil. fr. 23.12–13 *IEG* ἀνὴρ τοι δειλὸς ἄρ’ ἐφανόμην, | [οὐ]δ’ οἶός εἰμ’ ἐγὼ [ο]ὔτος οὐδ’ οἶων ἄπο, Carm. Conv. fr. 907.2–4 *PMG* οἶους ἄνδρας ἀπώλεσας . . . | οἱ τότε ἔδειξαν οἶων πατέρων ἕσαν, Harder on

Eur. fr. 231.2 *TGF*. Sense and word order indicate that πατρός goes with ἐν ἐχθροῖς, not οἴου. Ajax wants Eurysaces to stand up to Ajax's enemies, as a son would be expected to; cf. *Ant.* 641–4, where Creon says that men pray to have obedient sons ὡς καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἀνταμύνωνται κακοῖς, | καὶ τὸν φίλον τιμῶσιν ἐξ ἴσου πατρί, and the killing of children such as Astyanax, to check the possibility of future vengeance. There is no need to take πατρός with both, since the polyptoton is self-contained. For τρέφομαι implying 'be born' cf. 1229, *Phil.* 3, Moussy (1969) 62–7. Writing ἑράφης (thus NP, *coni.* B. Heath (1762) 6) restores the augment.

558–9 τέως δὲ κούφοις πνεύμασιν βόσκου νέαν | ψυχὴν ἀτάλλων, μητρὶ τῇδε χαρμονήν. 'Meanwhile nourish your young soul on the gentle breezes in your innocence, a source of joy to your mother here.' For the sense of τέως cf. Eur. *Held.* 725, Lloyd-Jones (1994) 132–3 = (2005) 119, Redondo (2003) 422. 'The application of βόσκω, its compounds and congeners to human beings in comedy often implied contempt [cf. Headlam on Herodas 7.44] . . . , but not in tragedy' (Arnott on Alexis fr. 313 *PCG*; cf. 570, Moussy (1969) 17–18). For the verb in this context cf. *Ti.* 144–5 τὸ γὰρ νεάζον ἐν τοιοῖσδε βόσκεται | χώροισιν αὐτοῦ, Anacr. fr. 417.5 *PMG*. For nourishment from the wind cf. Pl. *Resp.* 401cd, Dio Chrys. 12.30 τρεφόμενοι τῇ διηνεκεῖ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιρροῇ, ἄερα ὑγρὸν ἔλκοντες, ὥστε νήπιοι παῖδες, Lobeck (1829) 1 760, Padel (1992) 97 n. 65.

ἀτάλλω means 'be ἀταλός, a word associated with carefree innocence, especially of youth (cf. *CEG* 1 432.1, Athens, 3rd quarter of 8th c., ἡὸς νῦν ὀρχεσθὲν πάντων ἀταλότατα παίζει, Hom. *Il.* 18.567 ἡἴθεοι ἀταλά φρονέοντες, *Od.* 11.39 παρθενικαὶ τ' ἀταλαὶ νεοπενθέα θυμὸν ἔχουσαι, Hes. *Th.* 989 παῖδ' ἀταλά φρονέοντα with West, Leumann (1950) 139–41, Heitsch (1965) 46–53). For the intransitive sense cf. Hes. *Op.* 130–1 ἑκατὸν μὲν παῖς ἔτεα παρὰ μητέρι κεδνῇ | ἐτρέφετ' ἀτάλλων μέγα νήπιος ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, Hom. *Il.* 13.27 ἄταλλε δὲ κήτε' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. The word may be prompted by *Il.* 6.400 παῖδ' ἐπὶ κόλπῳ ἔχουσ' ἀταλάφρονα, νήπιον αὐτῷ. Construe ψυχὴν with βόσκου; the latter is probably a middle taking a direct object, although, if the unparalleled middle is thought objectionable, it could be a passive accompanied by an accusative of respect (954/5–956n.). Scholars commonly take ἀτάλλω as transitive (punctuating after βόσκου), governing ψυχὴν; but the sense 'nourish, cultivate' (cf. Pind. fr. 214.1–3 S–M καρδίαν ἀτάλλοισα . . . Ἐλπίς, *Hom. Hym.* 4.400 ἡχοῦ δὴ τὰ χρήματ' ἀτάλλετο (v.l.; 'where the stock had been foddered' – West); also reduplicated ἀτιτάλλω of rearing children at *Il.* 24.59–60, *Od.* 18.323, Pind. *N.* 3.57–8) with ψυχὴ as its object would be better predicated of a separate individual.

μητρὶ τῇδε χαρμονήν recalls Hom. *Il.* 6.481 χαρεῖη δὲ φρένα μήτηρ; the accusative is in apposition to the rest of the sentence (cf. 1191, 1209/10, Bruhn

§11, Diggle (1978) 171 = (1994) 191–2, Moorhouse 45–6). The expression shows that Ajax can enter imaginatively into Tecmessa's emotional world, even though in the rest of the speech he chooses not to.

560–4 Teucer gives orders regarding the rescue of Eurysaces at 983–9, where the chorus remind us of Ajax's words (990–1).

560–1 οὗτοι σ' Ἀχαιῶν, οἶδα, μή τις ὑβρίσῃ | στυγναῖσι λῶβαις, οὐδὲ χωρὶς ὄντ' ἐμοῦ. 'None of the Achaeans, I know, will outrage you with hateful violence, not even when you are away from me.' Prominently parenthetical οἶδα may encourage the audience to wonder how Ajax could be so sure. Zf has ὑβρίσει, but the future with this construction (*El.* [1052]n.) is much rarer. We would in any case expect ὑβριεῖ as the Attic future (at *Ar. Thesm.* 719 (lyr.) R reads ἐνυβρίσεις, but editors emend to –ιείς).

562–4 τοῖον πυλωρὸν φύλακα Τεῦκρον ἀμφὶ σοὶ | λείψω τροφῆς ἄοκνον ἔμπα κεί τανῦν | τηλωπὸς οἰχνεῖ, δυσμενῶν θήραν ἔχων. 'Such is the warder that I will leave to protect you, namely Teucer, a man unhesitating in his support, even if he is now gone far-off, engaged in the hunt for the enemy.' Ajax's encouragement to his son may recall Zeus' to Priam (via Iris) at *Hom. Il.* 24.152–3 (≈ 24.181–2): μηδέ τι οἱ θάνατος μελέτω φρεσὶ μηδέ τι τάρβος. | τοῖον γάρ οἱ πομπὸν ὀπάσσομεν Ἀργεῖφόντην. For τοῖον see 251/2–253/4n. πυλωρός, literally 'gate-keeper' (e.g. *Aesch. Sept.* 621, *Eur. Her.* 1277), metaphorically denotes a protector. For ἀμφὶ with the dative see 302–4n.; for σοὶ (Diggle) rather than σοι see 292n. ἔμπα, with a short alpha, is metrically guaranteed at *Pind. N.* 4.36, *Ap. Rh.* 1.791, 3.641, *Call. A.P.* 7.521.3 = 1239 *HE*, fr. incert. 726 Pfeiffer; usually the word is written ἔμπας with a long alpha (cf. Björck (1950) 123–4 n. 1), which here would break Porson's Law. For καὶ εἰ 'introduc[ing] an admitted fact' cf. 692, 962, Denniston 302.

τηλωπὸς (elsewhere at *Phil.* 215/16, *Lyr. Adesp.* fr. 929(e).2 *PMG*) is glossed τηλουρός (not attested for S., but a common word, found in tragedy), which appears to be the origin of the non-word τηλουργός offered by *L^{7p}*. οἰχνέω is poetic, found in Homer, Pindar, and tragedy (*El.* 165, 313). For δυσμενῶν θήραν ἔχων cf. 880/1, *Phil.* 839–40 θήραν | τήνδ' ἀλίως ἔχομεν τόξων, *OR* 566 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔρευναν τοῦ κανόντος [Herwerden: θανόντος codd.] ἔσχετε;, and the related idiom illustrated at 203–4n. θήραν is more vigorous and thematically satisfying than the minority variant φρουράν, which probably comes from φρουρούς in the scholia (p. 137 Chr.).

565–6 ἀλλ', ἄνδρες ἀσπιστῆρες, ἐνάλιος λεώς, | ὑμῖν τε κοινὴν τήνδ' ἐπισκήπτω χάριν 'But, shield-bearing men, people of the sea, on you, as on him, I lay this task of kindness.' For ἀλλά introducing an imperative see n. on 194a. For ἀνήρ with another noun identifying a 'professional' cf. *OR* 1118 νομεύς ἀνὴρ, *Hom. Il.* 11.514 ἱητρός... ἀνὴρ, *Sappho* fr. 105b.1 Voigt

ποιόμενες ἄνδρες, Hdt. 6.83.2 ἄνῆρ μόντις, von Staden (2007) 448 with n. 102. The expected form is ἄσπιστής, which is found in Homer and tragedy as well as prose (Ernst Fraenkel (1910–12) I 22–3 n. 2). ἄσπιστήρ is attested elsewhere only at Eur. *Held.* 277, and ὑπασπιστήρ at Aesch. *Suppl.* 182, while Aesch. *Ag.* 404 has ἄσπιστωρ (S–D I 530–1); these are (probably false) archaisms (cf. Fraenkel (1910–12) I 136–7, Sideras (1971) 153–4, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 182). For ἐνάλιος λεώς cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 383 ναυτικὸν λεῶν and the expressions collected by Diggle (1981c) = (1994) 219. For the orthography of ἐνάλιος (here metrically guaranteed, against most manuscripts) see Pind. *P.* 11.40n. The nominative, not the vocative, is used even though it accompanies a vocative noun, because λεώς does not have a distinctive vocative form (see Moorhouse 23–4). Vocative λεώς followed by instructions recalls expressions meaning ‘listen, people’ (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 681, Ar. *Ach.* 1000, Haubold (2000) 202). For ‘imperious’ (Davies (1982) 275) ἐπισκήπτω cf. *Ti.* 1221, *OR* 1446.

567–70 κείνῳ τ’ ἐμὴν ἀγγείλατ’ ἐντολήν, ὅπως | τὸν παῖδα τόνδε πρὸς δόμους ἐμούς ἄγων | Τελαμῶνι δείξει μητρί τ’, Ἐριβοίᾳ λέγω, | ὥς σφιν γένηται γηροβοσκὸς εἰσαεῖ. ‘and proclaim my instruction to him – that he should take my son home and present him to Telamon and my mother, I mean Eriboea, so he may support their old age for the rest of their lives.’ For the construction ἀγγείλατ’... ὅπως... δείξει, together with the corruption to δείξει, see 556–7n. ἐντολή has a formal, even imperious ring suitable for Ajax’s solemn instruction. For δείκνυμι in similar expressions Gonda (1929) 38 compares *Phil.* 492 (Take me to Oeta) πατρί μ’ ὥς δείξης φίλῳ and *Hom. Hym.* 5.133–4 ἀδμήτην μ’ ἀγαγὼν καὶ ἀπειρήτην φιλότῃος | πατρί τε σὺ δείξον καὶ μητέρι κέδν’ εἰδυῖη.

Ajax’s mother is named Eriboea first by Pind. *I.* 6.45 (on which see Burnett (2005) 83 n. 6); cf. Bacchyl. 13.102, Philostephanus of Cyrene fr. 35 *FHG* (III 33) = ΣD Hom. *Il.* 16.14 Van Thiel (where she is specified as the daughter of Alcathus, elsewhere Alcathous, whom Telamon marries after fleeing to Salamis upon killing one of his fellow hunters on the Calydonian boar hunt), Diod. Sic. 4.72.7. A red-figure cup of 440–430 attributed to the Kodros painter shows a woman of that name presenting a covered item (presumably the baby Ajax) to Telamon (Touchefeu (1981) §12; cf. Berger (1968), especially 128–9). Aretades of Cnidos gives a different account of Telamon’s union, without naming the woman (fr. 3 *FHG* = IV 316). Telamon seduces a girl on Euboea and flees; on noticing, her father (presumably the local ruler) gives her to one of his bodyguards to kill, who takes pity on her and sells her on Salamis – to Telamon. She then gives birth to Ajax.

She is called Periboea at Xen. *Cyn.* 1.9, Apollod. 3.12.7, Paus. 1.42.4, Plut. *Thes.* 29.1 (a wife of Theseus); this is a likely variant in the Philostephanus

fragment cited above, where one manuscript reads ἡ Ἐριβοίαν [*sic*], with ἡ probably corrupted from π (H/Π in uncials). A further variation appears in Ister (*FGHist* 334 F 10), according to whom Theseus married Meliboea, ‘the mother of Ajax’. (Another wife of Theseus by a similar name, Phereboea, is attested by Pher. Ath. fr. 153 *EGM* and Plut. *Thes.* 29.1; while the François vase depicts a girl called Epiboea as one of the maidens saved by Theseus from the Minotaur. The proliferation of names in –βοία for these minor mythological figures was no doubt as confusing at the time as it is for us; we cannot reconstruct which was ‘original’ in each case, if indeed that is a meaningful question.)

A noun in apposition to another in the dative or genitive can retain its case even when governed by λέγω: cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 658–9 ἐπωνύμῳ δὲ κάρτα, Πολυνεΐκει [v.l. –ῃ] λέγω, | τάχ’ εἰσόμεσθα τούπισημ’ ὅποι τελεῖ, fr. 175 *TrGF* ἄλλ’ Ἀντικλείας ὅσσον ἦλθε Σίσυφος, | τῆς σῆς λέγω τοι μητρός, ἡ σ’ ἐγείνατο, Lobbeck’s n., and K–G 1 283–4. We should reject Ἐριβοίαν (thus Valckenaer (1743–6) 15 recto; for confusion of –αν and –α cf. 756, *El.* 180–1n.). For other examples of λέγω ‘I mean’ (104n.) used parenthetically see Mastronarde (1988) 156 n. 11 (supplemented on Eur. *Phoen.* 987–8), De Jong (2007b) 12 n. 19; Ajax refers to his mother, not Teucer’s.

For the idea that children should look after their parents in old age see 506–13n. For εἰσαίε relative to a person’s lifetime Renehan (1992) 346 compares *El.* 650 ὧδέ μ’ αἰεὶ ζώσαν ἀβλαβεῖ βίῳ, Solon fr. 18 *IEG* (cited below, 594–5n.).

[571 μέχρις οὗ μυχούς κίχῳσι τοῦ κάτω θεοῦ] ‘until they reach the recesses of the god below’. Elmsley (1814) 363 deletes this line, saying ‘perhaps it was inserted by some scrupulous critic, who thought that the expression γηροβοσκὸς εἰς αἶε, in the preceding verse, required some qualification’. μέχρις is not Attic (cf. Wecklein (1869) 51–2, W. Arnott (2002) 194–5), and neither it nor μέχρι appear elsewhere in tragedy. Moreover, while the anapaest beginning the first metron can be paralleled (figures at West (1982) 82; many, but not all, are proper names), even with the split after the second syllable (Euripidean examples at Diggle (1974) 34 = (1994) 133–4), the metrical irregularity could so easily have been avoided that it is hard to believe that it is original.

Hermann (in his edition of Euripides’ *Hecuba*, p. liv) replaces μέχρις οὗ with ἔστ’ ἄν. In his editions of *Ajax* he compares [Aesch.] *PV* 376, where he claims that ἔστ’ ἄν is glossed by μέχρις οὗ; I cannot find a mention of this gloss in editions of Aeschylean scholia. Dawe, *STS* 1 144–5, additionally cites *Suda* ε 3204 (II 429.6 Adler) ἔσπε· μέχρις οὗ and Hesych. ε 6367 (II 209 Latte) ἔστ’ ἄν· ἔως οὗ. But Renehan (1992) 346 plausibly suggests that the heavy assonance, such as μεχ– μυχ– κίχ– and οὗ τοῦ θεοῦ, is a deliberate sound effect, and that the line stands or falls as a whole. Elmsley’s deletion thus becomes the more probable cure, especially as a motive for interpolation is obvious.

For *μυχός* of the Underworld see da Rocha Pereira (1961) 167, West on Hes. *Th.* 119. Calling Hades ‘the god below’ (parallels at West on Hes. *Op.* 465 and on *Th.* 767) implies a reluctance to name the dreadful deity (*El.* 110n.).

572–3 καὶ τὰμὰ τεύχη μήτ’ ἀγωνάρχαι τινὲς | θήσουσ’ Ἀχαιοὶς μήθ’ ὁ <—x—υ— | x—υ—x—υ> λυμεῶν ἐμός. ‘And as for my weapons, no stewards of the games will set them before the Achaeans, nor will that . . . , my nemesis.’ The lacuna proposed by J. Jackson (1955) 232–3 solves two separate problems. (i) ὁ λυμεῶν ἐμός is probably impossible Greek. The position of the possessive is paralleled only by Eur. *Hipp.* 683 Ζεὺς σ’ ὁ γεννήτωρ ἐμός, where editors print Wolff’s σε. Radermacher defends both passages on the ground that the two nouns, both *nomina agentis*, retain a quasi-verbal force (standing for ὁ γεννήσας ἐμέ and ὁ λυμηνάμενος ἐμέ; similarly Fraenkel (1977) 17–18). But if this phenomenon were possible, we would expect to meet it more than twice. Epic expressions such as Hom. *Od.* 17.10 τὸν ξεῖνον δύστηνον are irrelevant, since there τὸν functions as an independent pronoun (‘that man, the wretched foreigner’). (ii) It is odd to find Odysseus alongside the ἀγωνάρχαι as joint subjects of θήσουσ’; ‘Ajax’s principal fear is . . . not that he will offer the arms to others as prizes, but that he will get them himself’ (West (1978a) 111). (A third objection mentioned by West, that the paradosis is an excessively allusive reference to Odysseus, I find less compelling in the light of 445.)

These problems are solved by a supplement along the lines of <Σισύφου γόνος | οἶσει, τὸ παιπάλημα,> (West) or <Σ. γ. | κλέπει κακοῖς ψήφοισι,>. Jackson suggests <Σισύφου δορὸς | πιστὸν νεμεῖ πρόβλημα>, giving a construction to αὐτό in 574, but τεύχη should be common to both μήτε clauses. Rather than posit a lacuna, Schaefer (his edition, 1 232–3) emends μήθ’ ὁ to μήτε, but the article is more forceful (cf. Jebb, Fraenkel (1983) 442).

ἀγωνάρχης is attested at *IG* vii 1817 = *IThesp* 283.1 (Thespieae, 3rd–2nd c. bc?), *IThesp* 84.3 (Thespieae, end of 3rd c. bc), *IGSK* xxxiii 132.8 (2nd c. ad). For –άρχης compounds more generally see 388–91n. For θήσουσ’ of the setting out of prizes cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.546 ἔθηκε δὲ πόντια μήτηρ, *Il.* 23.263, 653; also κείμει as illustrated at 934–5n. The disguised Odysseus describes himself as ὁ κοινὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων λυμεῶν at Eur. *Phil.* fr. 789d.30 *TrGF* (Dio’s paraphrase).

574–6 ἀλλ’ αὐτό μοι σύ, παῖ, λαβὼν τοῦπώνυμον, | Εὐρύσακες, ἴσχε διὰ πολυρράφου στρέφων | πόρπακος ἑπτάβοιον ἄρρηκτον σάκος. ‘No, you take hold of the very thing which gives you your name, Eurysaces my son, and grip the unbreakable shield of seven hides, wielding it with the well-stitched strap.’ The opening of this scene saw Ajax’s meditation on the grimly appropriate similarity between his name and a cry of agony (430–1n.). As he completes his final instructions to his son and heir, he employs that same motif again, but

with an optimistic tone: if Ajax's name marked him out for sorrow, onomastical destiny links Eurysaces to deeds of prowess. The elaborate description of the shield also has a proudly celebratory ring.

Goldhill (1987) 70–1 ≈ (1990) 118 sees a reference to a ceremony at the Dionysia which took place before the tragedies, in which the orphans of men killed while fighting for Athens, who had grown up supported by the state, marched in a hoplite panoply with which they were equipped at state expense. I am sceptical, for four reasons.

(i) Eurysaces is inheriting his shield from his father according to regular custom, not acquiring it from a sympathetic third party after his father's death. The absence of the physical shield may also have made it harder to trigger this event in the minds of the audience. And as the Athenian orphans got a full set of armour, not just a shield, it is odd (under this interpretation) that Ajax should emphasise that none of his armour apart from the shield will be available to his son (577). Allusions do not require an exact fit; often the differences between two similar comparanda are significant (as in Goldhill's analysis). But they do require in the first instance a certain level of similarity, which does not seem present here.

(ii) In Euripides' *Suppliants* the children of the Seven against Thebes, after lamenting their status as orphans (1131–3), ask ἄρ' ἄσπιδοῦχος ἔτι ποτ' ἀντιτείσσομαι | σὸν φόνον; (1143–4), and claim that their homeland will receive them as a χαλκείοις <ἐν> ὀπλοῖς Δαναΐδων στρατηλάταν, | τοῦ φθιμένου πατρὸς ἐκδικαστάν (1150–1). If the scene in *Ajax* provoked thoughts of the ceremony, presumably this one did too. Yet the focus is on not any τροφή offered by the city to the orphans, but the vengeance which they, the Epigoni, will exact on reaching manhood (as confirmed by Athena, 1213–26).

(iii) The two sources which provide our information for this ceremony (Isocr. 8.82, Aeschin. 3.154; see Goldhill, 63–4 ≈ 105–6) both date to about a century or more after the likely performance of *Ajax* (after 355 BC, and 330 BC respectively). Since ceremonies do change over time, it may well be that the march of the orphans was unknown when *Ajax* was first performed.

(iv) Goldhill assumes that *Ajax* was first performed at the Dionysia, but we cannot be sure of this. It might have been put on at the Lenaea or Rural Dionysia (Introduction §2).

τοῦπώνυμον for manuscript ἐπώνυμον (a crasis error: 39n.) is owed to Fraenkel (1967a) 84–6. Bergk (his edition, p. liv) prefers a lacuna after 573, though without specifying possible contents; for Jackson's lacuna, see previous n. Since αὐτό cannot mean 'this' or 'that', the transmitted text means 'take hold of it, from which you get your name, . . . the shield'. Budelmann (2000) 34–5 retains the paradosis, but his translation 'the thing from which you take your name' reveals the need for an article. The position of the name, already emphatic (462–3n.), has particular weight coming straight after τοῦπώνυμον.

For parallels for this sense of ἐπώνυμος (usually passive, ‘named after’) see LSJ⁹ s.v. π, Lloyd-Jones (1966) 145–6 = (1990b) 83. Eurysaces takes his name from an attribute of his parent: cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.399–403 (Astyanax), Hom. *Hym.* 5.198–9 (Aeneas), Kakridis (1949) 31.

διὰ denotes the instrument, but the choice of preposition may have been influenced by the place of the soldier’s arm through the strap (cf. Moorhouse 102). The position of στρέφων is an instance of ‘the insertion of a word . . . into an expression consisting of a noun plus preposition and its adjectival attribute’ (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 964, citing examples from S. and Aeschylus such as Aesch. *Eum.* 806 and 851 ὑμεῖς δ’ ἐξ ἀλλόφυλον ἐλθοῦσαι χθόνα).

The πόρπαξ was a metal strap on the back of a hoplite shield through which a soldier thrust his left arm up to the elbow (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1376 ἐμβάλων πόρπακι [Victorius: ὀρπ– cod.] γενναίαν χέρα, *Tro.* 1194–6 ὦ καλλίπηχυν Ἔκτορος βραχίονα | σῶζουσ’ . . . | ὥς ἡδὺς ἐν πόρπακι σῶ κέται τύπος, Aelius Dionysus π 52 = p. 137 Erbse πόρπαξ· τὸ ἐντὸς τῆς ἀσπίδος πρόσθημα, δι’ οὗ τὴν χεῖρα διεῖρον), so that he could grasp the ἀντιλαβή (handle, perhaps made from leather: thus Schwartz (2009) 32) on the rim (ancient and modern illustrations in Snodgrass (1967) 53 with plates 18–19, Van Wees (2004) 166–71, Muth (2008) 142–238). It could be detached when the shield was not in use (cf. Bacchyl. fr. 4.69–70 S–M ἐν δὲ σιδαροδέτοις πόρπαξιν αἰθᾶν | ἀραχνᾶν ἱστοὶ πέλονται, Ar. *Eq.* 848–59, Critias D–K 88 v 37 = π 393.8–10). This type of shield is first attested, in art and archaeology, in the early to mid seventh century (Lorimer (1947) 80–93). According to Hdt. 1.171.4 (cf. Snodgrass (1964b)), the Carians were the first to make shields with ὄχανα (probably equivalent to πόρπακες, despite Plut. *Agis et Cleom.* 32.3 διδάξας αὐτοὺς . . . τὴν ἀσπίδα φορεῖν δι’ ὄχάνης, μὴ διὰ πόρπακος). Previously, Herodotus tells us, warriors employed shields τελαμῶσι σκυτίνοισι οἰηκίζοντες, περὶ τοῖσι αὐχέσι τε καὶ τοῖσι ἀριστεροῖσι ὤμοισι περικείμενοι; this description fits artistic depictions of the Mycenaean tower or body shield (cf. Lorimer (1950) 144–6, Càssola Guida (1973) 13–37, *ead. ap. eand.* and Zucconi Galli Fonseca (1992) 5–21) and is implied several times in the *Iliad* (cf. 5.796–7, 14.402–6, 16.802–3).

Our passage speaks of a πόρπαξ made out of leather. (Alternative explanations of πολυρράφου are unsatisfactory: leather ornamentation (Gow on [Theocr.] 25.265) would be unexpected on a metal shield-grip, while the use of leather to attach the πόρπαξ to the shield (Garvie) would weaken the shield’s defensive power and make removing the πόρπαξ a tiresome process.) There is no evidence for such a component in the hoplite shield (Eustathius 707.59 = π 563.2 Van der Valk refers to οἱ νῦν ἐξ ἰμάντων πόρπακες, ἥγουν τὰ ὄχανα, but this may be an inference from our passage), which is unsurprising, since metal is so obviously superior for this function. Van Leeuwen (on Ar. *Eq.* 849) suggests that S. uses πόρπαξ here to mean τελαμών, but στρέφων tells against

this: the τελαμών simply attaches the shield to the body, and does not allow the wearer to ‘wield’ the shield as the πόρπαξ does. It is possible that S. is conflating the metal πόρπαξ of his day with the leather τελαμών known to him from the *Iliad*; the leather πόρπαξ of this passage, something which did not exist in S.’s day or in the Bronze Age, is the result. Or else he is referring to a metal πόρπαξ covered in leather to prevent chafing of the bearer’s arm, which may have been a practice among contemporary hoplites (cf. Schwartz (2009) 30, who suggests that the inside of the hoplite shield could be padded with leather glued to the metal).

ἄρρηκτον σάκος recurs at Aesch. *Suppl.* 190; cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.267–8, 21.164–5 οὐδὲ . . . | ῥῆξε σάκος.

577 τὰ δ’ ἄλλα τεύχη κοῖν’ ἔμοι τεθάψεται. ‘My other weapons will be buried together with me.’ This form of the future perfect (elsewhere ταφήσομαι) recurs at 1141 and Eur. *IT* 1464. The tense implies ‘be buried and stay so’ (Moorhouse 202; cf. *El.* 230n.). In epic warriors are normally burned, not buried; in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 3 *GEF*), Ajax’s body was ‘placed in a coffin’ (and presumably buried), not burned, ‘because of the anger of the king’ (presumably Agamemnon). But the question of burning Ajax’s body is never raised in S.’s play; rather, burial is assumed to have been standard procedure in the Bronze Age. Some epic funerals involve the cremation of weapons together with the body: cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.418 ἀλλ’ ἄρα μιν κατέκχε σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν, *Od.* 11.74 ἀλλὰ με κακῆσαι σὺν τεύχεσιν, 12.13, Andronikos (1968) 23–4. Contrast the elaborate funerals of Patroclus (*Il.* 23.165–257), Hector (24.785–804), and Achilles (*Od.* 24.65–84), where no weapons are burned.

578–80 ἀλλ’ ὡς τάχος τὸν παῖδα τόνδ’ ἤδη δέχου, | καὶ δῶμα πάκτου, μηδ’ ἐπισκήνους γόους | δάκρυε. ‘But now take this boy with all speed, close fast the dwelling, and don’t cry and lament in front of the hut.’ At this point, or shortly after, Ajax lifts Eurysaces from the floor of the ekkyklema and gives him to Tecmessa who sets him on the ground; he is probably too big for her to keep in her arms. Ajax’s preference for private grief is shared by the Messenger at *Ant.* 1246–9 (referring to Eurydice) ἐλπίσιν δὲ βόσκομαι | ἄχῃ τέκνου κλυοῦσαν ἐς πόλιν γόου | οὐκ ἀξιώσκειν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ στέγῃς ἔσω | δμωαῖς προθήσειν πένθος οἰκεῖον στένειν; cf. *OR* 1430–1 (Creon on Oedipus) τοῖς ἐν γένει γὰρ τὰ γενεῇ μόνους θ’ ὄραν | μόνους τ’ ἄκούειν εὐσεβῶς ἔχει κακά.

For ἀλλά introducing an imperative see n. on 194a. δῶμα πάκτου is Eustathius’s reinterpretation of the meaningless δῶμ’ ἀπάκτου of the manuscripts (742.43, 1532.60, 1937.62 = π 683.13 Van der Valk, 1 211.46, π 294.45–6 Stallbaum). Turnebus first prints the correct division, though without specifying his source; Stephanus (1568) 13 first acknowledges Eustathius. For πακτώω in this context cf. Archil. fr. 279 *IEG* πακτώσαι (meaning κλεῖσαι,

according to Pollux 10.27 = 11 197.14 Bethe), Hippon. fr. 104.19 *IEG* τήν] θύρην ἐπάκτωσα, Eur. fr. 1003 *TrGF* λῦε πακτὰ δωμάτων, Ar. *Lys.* 265, *Vesp.* 128, fr. 737 *PCG*. For errors involving incorrect word division see 177–8n.

580 κάρτα τοι φιλοίκτιστον γυνή. ‘A woman is strongly given to pity.’ Contrast Odysseus’ attitude to pity (121–6n.). Ajax likes γινῶμαι when dealing with Tecmessa (cf. 293). For the idea cf. 650–2, Eur. *Her.* 536 τὸ θῆλυ γάρ πως μᾶλλον οἰκτρὸν ἄρσένων, *Med.* 928 γυνή δὲ θῆλυ κάπῃ δακρύοις ἔφυ, *IT* 1054, Arist. *HA* 608b.8–9 γυνή ἀνδρὸς ἐλεημονέστερον καὶ ἄριδακρυ μᾶλλον, Dover (1974) 101. For proverbial τοι see 455–6n. For the neuter predicate cf. Eur. *El.* 1035 μῶρον μὲν οὖν γυναικες, K–G 1 58–9, S–D 11 605–6, Diggle (1983) 348 = (1994) 260–1 (to which JD now adds Theogn. 457, Men. fr. 236.7 *PCG*), *id.* on Theophr. *Char.* 26.2 (p. 468). The construction is typical of gnomic utterances, not off-hand or contemptuous.

581 πύκαζε θᾶσσον. ‘Shut it now!’ θᾶσσον with the imperative means “‘at once’”, without comparative force’ (MacDowell on Ar. *Vesp.* 187); cf. Arnott on Alexis fr. 239.4 *PCG*. For πυκάζω (usually ‘cover’) in this sense cf. Hom. *Od.* 12.224–5 μή . . . ἐντὸς . . . πυκάζοιεν σφέας αὐτοῦς.

581–2 οὐ πρὸς ἱατροῦ σοφοῦ | θρηνεῖν ἐπωδὰς πρὸς τομῶντι πῆματι. ‘It is not the task of a good doctor to wail incantations over a sore that needs surgery.’ Ajax needs a remedy which requires cutting (cf. Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 539); mere expressions of grief will not heal him (cf. 852, *El.* 137–9n.). The practical Ajax distinguishes between medicine and magic (cf. Rocconi (2001) 280); elsewhere these interventions are often seen as complementary (cf. *Ti.* 1001–3 τίς γὰρ ἀοιδός, τίς ὁ χειροτέχνας | ἱατορίας, ὅς τάνδ’ ἄταν | χωρὶς Ζηνὸς κατακλήσει; with Davies, Hom. *Od.* 19.456–8 ὠτειλὴν . . . | δῆσαν ἐπισταμένως, ἐπαοιδῇ δ’ αἶμα κελαινὸν | ἔσχεθον, Diodorus of Carystus fr. dub. 150 Van der Eijk, Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.217(c), West (2007) 334, Willi (2008) 316 n. 29). For πρὸς + genitive = ‘in the nature of’ see 319–20n. For σοφός referring to technical skill cf. *Ant.* 365–6, 1059, Mülke (2007) 25. For Ajax’s fondness for γινῶμαι when dealing with Tecmessa see 293n.

There are two significant textual variants. θροεῖν (for θρηνεῖν) has good authority, but unhelpfully removes the pungent reference to lamentation (cf. also 629/30–631). It may have arisen from 592 (so Dawe, *STS* 1 145). For the corruption cf. possibly *Phil.* 208/9, *El.* 853 (but see my n.). τραύματι may be an ancient variant (cf. Sandbach *ap.* Dawe, *STS* 1 145 n. 1), but the τραυ–stem does not occur elsewhere in S.’s extant works (themselves hardly short on wounds), perhaps because it was too prosaic. Most likely it originated here as a gloss on πῆματι, indicating the precise sense of the general word (28n., *El.* 797n.).

583–95 The closing stichomythia is similar to two passages from later tragedy: *OC* 1437–46 (Polynices rejects the pleas of his sister Antigone as he goes off to certain death) and Eur. *Hipp.* 722–4 (Phaedra rejects the chorus’s dissuasion as she departs to kill herself; Kovacs (1987) 134 n. 83 identifies a ‘conscious borrowing’ from our play). If this was an established pattern at the time of the production of *Ajax*, it would have confirmed the audience’s likely inference that Ajax is leaving to commit suicide.

The exchange is characterised by both variety (utterances of half, one, and two lines) and regularity (the length of the characters’ speeches is balanced until the very end; even their two-line speeches have a strong pause in corresponding places). At 591–4 the exchange accelerates into *antilabe*, a sign of emotional agitation (*El.* 1209n., Pfeiffer-Petersen (1996) 20), Hogan (1997) 54–9). Only at the close does the symmetry break down, when Tecmessa’s half-line is capped by Ajax’s one and a half. This asserts his control at the moment when his will finally prevails and the doors are shut.

583–4 δέδοικ’ ἀκούων τήνδε τὴν προθυμίαν. | οὐ γάρ μ’ ἀρέσκει γλῶσσά σου τεθηγμένη. ‘I am afraid as I listen to your eager purpose: I do not like the whetted edge of your speech.’ ἀκούων sometimes occurs where ἀκούσας might be expected (FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 621). The accusative with ἀρέσκω ‘be pleasing’ (instead of the usual dative) is common in Attic: cf. Eur. *Or.* 210 (same phrase), K–G I 294. For the ‘whetted tongue’ cf. Tr. Adesp. fr. 423 *TrGF* ἄδοξον, ἄκραν γλῶσσαν ἡκονημένον, Psalm 64.3 ‘who whet their tongue like a sword’, West (1997) 230–1; also Aesch. *Sept.* 715 τεθηγμένον τοί μ’ οὐκ ἀπαμβλυνεῖς λόγῳ (Eteocles, as he hastens to his death), [Aesch.] *PV* 311 (λόγοι), Eur. *Or.* 1625 (λήμα), Sansone (1975) 6, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 186–7, Pind. *O.* 6.82–3.

585 ὦ δέσποτ’ Αἴας, τί ποτε δρασεῖς φρενί; ‘Lord Ajax, whatever do you have in mind?’ After the chorus’s foreboding comment, Tecmessa puts the question directly. For the vocative see 368n. Locative φρενί (525–6n.) is replaced with φρόσον by Nauck⁸ p 188, but the paradosis emphasises Ajax’s concealment of his purpose, as well as Tecmessa’s concern for his mental state; the desiderative verb (326n.) also locates the action in the mind.

586 μὴ κρίνε, μὴ ζέταζε· σωφρονεῖν καλόν. ‘Don’t ask, don’t question. Discretion is good.’ Ajax’s ‘refusal to entertain a question’ (Mastrorade (1979) 83–4) results from his desire for secrecy, as well as his continued treatment of Tecmessa as a subordinate; again, he fobs her off with a γνώμη (293n.). The double asyndeton of staccato two-word phrases suggests impatience, as may κρίνω in the sense of ἀνακρίνω (*El.* 1445–6n.).

587–8 οἶμ’ ὡς ἄθυμῶ· πρὸς σε καὶ τοῦ σοῦ τέκνου | καὶ θεῶν ἰκνοῦμαι, μὴ προδοῦς ἡμᾶς γέννη. ‘Oimoi, how I am worried! By your own son and by the

gods I supplicate you, do not betray us!’ In contrast to 293–4, Tecmessa does not desist as Ajax wants her to: the urgency overcomes her natural obedience. ‘A suppliant invokes what is most φίλον to, or held most sacred by, the person supplicated’ (Willink on Eur. *Or.* 669–73, citing *Med.* 324, *IA* 909, 1233–4). Tecmessa’s appeal by their child, recently transferred from one parent to the other, may evoke appeals such as those made by Telephus (cf. Euripides’ play) and Themistocles (cf. Thuc. 1.136.3–137.1) while they carry a child (cf. Griffin (2007) 193), although Tecmessa is not actually carrying Eurysaces at this point.

πρός σε καί for transmitted καί σε πρός is owed to Tournier (1882) 115–16. We do not expect connecting καί before an urgent request of this type, and Stanford’s attempt to give it an alternative force (‘even so’) is desperate; placed before τοῦ, however, it elegantly binds together the twin objects of Tecmessa’s appeal. The emendation also restores the unstressed particle σε to an idiomatic position between πρός and its noun: cf. *Phil.* 468, *OC* 250, 1333, *Tr.* 436–7 μή, πρός σε [Hermann: σὲ vel σὺ codd.] τοῦ κατ’ ἄκρον Οἰταῖον νάπος | Διὸς καταστράπτοντος, Eur. *Alc.* 275 μὴ πρός <σε> θεῶν, 1098, *Med.* 324 μή, πρός σε [om. aliquot codd.] γονάτων, *Hipp.* 605, 607, *Andr.* 892, *Suppl.* 277 πρός <σε> γενειάδος, *Trö.* 1042, *IT* 1068, *Phoen.* 923, *IA* [909] πρός σε [Markland: σῆς cod.] δεξιᾶς, 1233 πρός σε [Markland: γε cod.] Πέλοπος, fr. 757.856 *TrGF*, Wackernagel (1892b) 360–1 = (1953–79) I 28–9, (1926–8) II 194 = (2009) 643. (The same idiom applies to other prepositions, as at cf. 906 ἐν γάρ οἱ χθονί, for which cf. Hdt. 6.69.4 ἐν γάρ σε τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ἀναιρέομαι, 1.108.2.) Scribal confusion over the construction, combined with the tendency for prepositions to be moved next to the nouns that they govern, resulted in πρός and καί swapping places. (A different kind of error in the same context led to πρός becoming καί in some manuscripts at *OC* 1333.) The position of σε in the paradosis could be paralleled by Eur. *Hipp.* 311–12 ἀπώλεσάς με, μαῖα, καί σε πρός θεῶν | τοῦδ’ ἀνδρὸς αὐθις λίσσομαι σιγᾶν πέρι, 503 ἄ μή σε [Nauck *post* Porson: καί μή γε codd.] πρός θεῶν, *Hom. Hym.* 5.131 ἀλλὰ σε πρός Ζηνὸς γουνάζομαι (cf. Wackernagel (1892) 357 = (1953–79) I 25); the sense of καί reveals the error (contrast Eur. *Hipp.* 311–12, where καί is a genuine connector).

For μὴ προδοῦς ἡμᾶς γένῃ cf. *Phil.* 772–3 μὴ . . . | . . . κτείνας γένῃ, 1067, *OR* 957 [v.l.], Phrynichus 3 F 20 *TrGF*, Tr. Adesp. fr. 348f.1 μὴ τὴν γε πρώτην χάριν ἀπαρνηθεὶς γένῃ, fr. 701.6, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 460. For elision of οἶμοι see 354–5n.

589–90 ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς. οὐ κάτοισθ’ ἐγὼ θεοῖς | ὥς οὐδὲν ἀρκεῖν εἴμ’ ὀφειλέτης ἔτι; ‘You pain me enough! Aren’t you aware that I owe no more service to the gods?’ Ajax picks up Tecmessa’s appeal by the gods and rejects it; he ignores her appeal by herself and her children.

Emphatic γε (Denniston 127) accompanies ἄγαν (354–5n.) at *Ant.* 573 ἄγαν γε [με Zf, *coni.* Blaydes] λυπείς, and in assentient ἄγαν γε (983, *Tr.* 896, *Eur. Her.* 1414). For λυπείς with με understood cf. *Ant.* 573, *Ar. Pax* 333 ἐπιδίδωμι τοῦτό γ' ὑμῖν ὥστε μὴ λυπεῖν ἔτι; for absolute λυπῶ Renehan (1992) 347 compares *Ant.* 1084 λυπείς γάρ, *OR* 1230–1. The minority variant με (Monac. gr. 507, *coni.* Jaeger (1811) 85) probably results from an intrusive gloss (28n.) displacing γε (ἐμε P^{gl}; cf. Zf at *Ant.* 573). Diggle (1976b) conjectures σε, citing passages like *Eur. Cycl.* 338 λυπεῖν [Triclinius: λι– cod.] δὲ μηδὲν αὐτόν and K–G 1 559 for σε meaning σεαυτόν; for the error cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 503. But the two appearances of ἄγαν γε λυπείς in S. support each other.

The juxtaposition ἐγὼ θεοῖς emphatically anticipates the subordinate clause to which it belongs, marking out the opposing pair. For ἀρκεῖν see 437–40n. For ὀφειλέτης cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 985 (Prometheus to Hermes, of Zeus) καὶ μὴν ὀφειλῶν γ' ἂν τίνοιμ' αὐτῷ χάριν, *Virg. Aen.* 11.51–2 *nil iam caelestibus ullis | debentem* (of the dead Pallas). [Eur.] *Rhes.* 965–6 may be a 'syntactical echo' (Fries) of this phrase.

591 εὐφημα φώνει. 'Speak words of good omen!' For the expression see 362n.

τοῖς ἀκούουσιν λέγε. 'Speak to people who'll listen to you.' For Ajax's retort cf. *Eur. Her.* 1185 (Θη.) εὐφημα φώνει. (Αμ.) βουλομένοισιν ἐπαγγέλλῃ; also *Eur. Hipp.* 724 (Χο.) εὐφημος ἴσθι. (Φα.) καὶ σύ γ' εὖ με νουθέτει. The form of the expression is paralleled by expressions like *El.* 853 ἰδομένῃ [Diggle: εἶδομεν ᾧ codd.] θροεῖς (see my n., to which JD now adds *Hom. Il.* 23.787, *Thuc.* 1.68.3, 2.36.4, 2.43.1, [Dem.] 25.47, *Pl. Hipp. Mai.* 301d).

592 σὺ δ' οὐχὶ πείσῃ; 'Won't you be persuaded?' For the reluctance of some of Sophocles' protagonists to be persuaded see Knox (1964) 13–15. Chrysothemis asks the same question of Electra at *El.* 402.

πόλλ' ἄγαν ἤδη θροεῖς. 'Already you are saying far too much.' Intensification of ἄγαν γε (589–90n.) signals Ajax's growing anger.

593 ταρβῶ γάρ, ὦναξ. 'Yes, because I am afraid.' For affirmative γάρ see 82n.

οὐ ξυνείρξεθ' ὡς τάχος; 'Won't you shut the door with all speed?' Ajax's previous commands to shut the door have been addressed to Tecmessa with a singular verb (579, 581). Since she, in her fear, is unwilling to close the door on him alone, he directs an order in the plural to attendants, who carry out his wishes immediately. Breaking off contact also marks contempt.

Blaydes¹ prints ξυνείρξεθ' instead of manuscript ξυνέρξεθ', restoring the expected Attic vocalism (cf. West's Teubner Aeschylus, pp. xlvii–xlviii); Elmsley¹ makes the same change at *OR* 890. The error, probably influenced by the epic vocalism, is found in the manuscripts of several authors (examples cited by

Jebb on *OR* 890), and FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 63 urge printing the paradosis in each case. But it is more likely that copyists occasionally mistook the vocalism than that they have faithfully preserved occasional lapses from Attic by the original writers.

594 πρὸς θεῶν, μαλάσσου. ‘By the gods, be softened!’ Tecmessa continues appealing by the gods despite 589–90: no new arguments are at hand. Her choice of verb is also unfortunate, ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐσθλῶν στέρνον οὐ μαλάσσεται (fr. 201e *TrGF*). The word looks forward to Ajax’s hardness imagery in 649–52.

594–5 μῶρά μοι δοκεῖς φρονεῖν, | εἰ τοῦμόν ἦθος ἄρτι παιδεύειν νοεῖς. ‘Your thoughts seem foolish to me, if you imagine that you can educate my character now.’ Next to ἄρτι the stem of παιδεύειν has its full force: Ajax portrays Tecmessa’s pleas as mere reprimands fit for a child. This is a perverse representation of her love for him, just as earlier his own παίδευσις of Eurysaces was a perversion of the proper function of the father as educator (545–82n.). For the idea that a capacity to learn disappears with maturity cf. Theogn. 578 μή με δίδασκ’ οὔτοι τηλικός εἰμι μαθεῖν; contrast Aesch. fr. 396 *TrGF* καλὸν δὲ καὶ γέροντι μανθάνειν σοφά and Solon’s γηράσκω δ’ αἰεὶ πολλὰ διδασκόμενος (fr. 18 *IEG*). See further Diggle’s *Theophrastus*, p. 477, on positive and negative attitudes to ὀψιμαθία. The weakly-attested variant λέγειν for φρονεῖν may have originated as a gloss (so De Marco (1936) 37; cf. 28n.), or just as a banal substitution (MLW). τοῦμόν ἦθος is ‘the innate disposition which will have its way’ (West on Hes. *Op.* 67); it looks back to, and implicitly rejects, the chorus’s appeal at 481–4 (cf. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 32).

Ajax leaves via the skene on the ekkyklema, leaving Tecmessa and Eurysaces on stage (thus Enger (1853b) 211–15, Poe (1987) 58–9 n. 117, Gardiner (1987) 63–4 n. 26, H/OK (2007) 368–70); the door is shut by attendants (593n.). Alternatively, Tecmessa enters the skene after him (Enger (1853a)); but as Poe argues, ‘she has just been rejected so emphatically by Ajax . . . that it is difficult to believe that she follows him . . . Such a simultaneous exit, in the same direction, of two characters who are at odds with each other, would . . . be unique in extant Greek tragedy.’ Ajax has also told her to shut the door, not enter the hut. He is also apparently intent on suicide, and the audience will suspect that he is going to carry this out after the door is shut (Σ p. 143 Chr. συγκέκληται ὁ Αἴας διαχρησόμενος ἑαυτόν). It would thus be ‘dramatically inept’ (Poe) for Tecmessa to accompany Ajax, since he would hardly commit suicide in front of her, and as a result the audience’s apprehension and suspense during the following choral ode would be reduced. Tecmessa’s increasingly frantic stichomythia with Ajax just before the end of the scene also has the ring of a person desperately trying to convince another while she still has the

chance. The effect would be weaker if Tecmessa accompanied him offstage and, presumably, continued pleading at her leisure.

Jebb has Tecmessa leave via a different door in the skene. But even if we accept the existence of such an opening (541–5n.), Tecmessa's entrance at 646, simultaneous with Ajax's, would be glaringly unmotivated (thus H/OK (2007) 369 n. 21). A γυναικῶν, to which such a door would presumably lead, should not be directly accessible from outside the dwelling (*ibid.* 368 n. 19).

Eurysaces remains with Tecmessa. H/OK (2007) 369 claim that he is taken off by attendants (presumably via the second door in the skene which they advocate). But there is no need for mother and child to be separated, and a separate departure would divert attention from the momentous, potentially fatal, closing of the skene door. Their argument (after Camerer (1953) 302) that Eurysaces, unlike Tecmessa, is not given a deictic pronoun by Ajax at 652, is weak; Tecmessa's deictic does double duty.

FIRST STASIMON (596–645)

596–645 Apprehension and despair characterise the chorus's song. The opening stanza juxtaposes the serenity of their homeland, Salamis, with the misery of life at Troy. Imperfective expressions describe the glory of the island (αἰεῖ) and the pain of the soldiers (599/600–605n.); the only conclusion that the chorus can expect is death itself (620/1). The antistrophe shifts the focus onto Ajax's suffering; exclamation (609/10) and repetition (620/1) create a 'heightened emotional style' (M. Heath (1987) 184). The imperfective misery of the strophe yields to a contrast between perfective moments of glory (his departure from Salamis) and despair (his present anguish). The grief of Ajax's parents frames the second strophic pair: the chorus imagine the loud manifestation of his mother's grief when she hears of her son's ruin (622/3–633), and pityingly invoke his father, who has still to learn the dreadful news (641/2–645). Tecmessa had emphasised the vulnerability of Ajax's aged parents deprived of their son (485–82n.); in the more plangent atmosphere of lyric, the chorus express their grief for his affliction.

Despite the atmosphere of sorrow, the prospect of Ajax's suicide has receded into the background (Gardiner (1987) 65–6); the closest that the chorus come to mentioning it is their claim that death is preferable to the suffering of madness (634/5). Emphasis falls on his present misery and the impact on his φίλοι. Paradoxically, this intensifies the horror: if Ajax's 'mere' madness is so catastrophic, his likely suicide will be still more dreadful. The chorus's understanding of the reasons for Ajax's madness is not as strong, however, as their imagination of its consequences. They see his recent actions as an aberration from a previously prosperous course, and fail to account for his

decision to kill the chiefs, which he took while sane and does not regret (612/13–616/17n., 639–40n.; contrast 481–4n.). This obtuseness aids their sympathy; the audience's emotional response will be more nuanced.

FIRST STROPHIC PAIR (596–607/8 ~ 609–620/1)

(1) 596	609	— — — — —	<i>gl</i>
(2) 596/7	609/10	— — — — —	<i>gl^Λia_Λ</i>
(3) 598	611	— — — — — ^H	<i>hag</i>
(4) 599/600	612/13	— — — — —	<i>ia gl</i>
(5) 601/3	614/16	— — — — —	<i>ia gl</i>
(6) 603/4	616/17	— — — — —	<i>gl^Λia_Λ</i>
(7) 605	618	— — — — —	<i>dodr^B</i>
(8) 606	619	— — — — —	<i>dodr^B</i>
(9) 607/8	620/1	— — — — —	<i>ia_Λia cho ia_Λ</i>

Straightforward aeolo-choriambic intermingled with iambic rhythms dominates the stanza. The cola at (1–2) and (5–6) are examples of what Dale (1936) 188 = (1969) 8 calls S.'s 'liking for the *rallentando* of three or more consecutive long syllables at the end of a period or of the strophe'. Usually (as here) a sense pause follows; Itsumi (1984) 79 suggests that it marks period end. For *ia gl* in (4–5), which recurs in (10–11) below, see Itsumi (1984) 79 (who lists tragic instances and suggests a Lesbian origin).

For the pair of cola in (7–8) Willink (2002) 57–8 = (2010) 392 compares Aesch. *Sept.* 903–904/5. They are probably not dochmiacs, since most of the examples of the abnormal dochmiac — — — — — recognised by West (1982) 111 are unsafe (cf. Diggle (1984b) 68 = (1994) 315): Aesch. *Sept.* 892 and 935 are dodrans B (as West interprets them in his edition, pp. 472–3), *Sept.* 147/8 may not be dochmiac (depending on whether one accepts responsion with West (1990) 102–4, or rejects it with Hutchinson), while at Eur. *Hec.* 1027 anomalous βίον can be removed by Hermann's βίον. Aesch. *Suppl.* 350 ~ 361 does appear sound, since it is found in a series of undeniable dochmiacs; but there are no reliable examples in S. or Euripides. In our passage there have been no dochmiacs so far, and it would be wrong to adopt such an extraordinary analysis when we can designate the cola as aeolo-choriambic.

For the colometry of (7–9) see L. Parker (1968) 242–3, who compares *Ant.* 797 and probably 1141/2 ~ 1150/1 for the resolved choriamb in (9). Her preferred analysis keeps the number of split resolutions down to one (as opposed to three or four in alternative analyses, which she cites), and even that (ἐπεσ' ἐπεσε) is covered by elision (and perhaps by the instantaneous repetition too). The anonymous note at Dale (1971–83) II 17 suggests that (9) is a 'dochmiac plus iambic-trochaic enneasyllable', but an isolated dochmiac should be avoided if possible.

SECOND STROPHIC PAIR (622/3–633 ~ 634/5–645)

(10) 622/3	634/5	— — — — — — — — — —	<i>ia gl</i>
(11) 624/5	636/7	⌣ — — — — — — — — — —	<i>ia gl</i>
(12) 625/6	637/8	— — — — — — — — — — ^H	<i>ia ia_α</i>
(13) 627	639	— — — — — — — — — —	<i>dodr</i>
(14) 628	640	— — — — — — — — — — ^H	<i>pher^C</i>
(15) 629/30	641/2	— — — — — — — — — — — —	<i>hi^C</i>
(16) 631	643	— — — — — — — — — —	<i>pher</i>
(17) 632	644	— — — — — — — — — —	<i>pher</i>
(18) 633	645	— — — — — — — — — — — —	<i>gl ia_α</i>

Aeolo-choriambic with an admixture of iambics continues to prevail. For (10–11) see (4–5) above. Wilamowitz (1921) 510 interprets (13–18) as δ *zion zion zion phal(aecian)*; Dale swings between aeolo-choriambic and ionic analyses at different stages in her career (cf. Dale (1971–83) II 17, where add a reference to Dale (1936) 202 = (1969) 21). While an ionic analysis is possible, aeolo-choriambic better fits the rest of the ode; it also yields a pair of shorter cola immediately before the final colon, attractively mirroring the pattern of the strophe. Willink (2002) 59 = (2010) 394–5 also prefers an ionic analysis, claiming that this ‘does better justice to the invariably long second position and to the elided postpositive δ’ in [631 = (16)]’. Aeolic base frequently shows inexact responson (— — ~ — — etc.), but of all the possible combinations, exact responson is much the most common (cf. Itsumi (1984) 67). So across Greek tragedy we would expect sometimes to come across five successive bases showing this phenomenon, as we do in (14–18). As for Willink’s second point, for pendant aeolo-choriambic cola ending with elision Parker (1976) 23 compares [Eur.] *Rhes.* 911 and Ar. *Vesp.* 318b.

For — — — — — as a regular clausula to a longer aeolic colon in (18) see Diggle (1994) 505.

596–8 ὦ κλεινὰ Σαλαμίς, σὺ μὲν που ναίεις ἀλίπληκτος εὐδαίμων, | πᾶσιν
περίφαντος αἰεὶ ‘Famous Salamis, you lie lashed by the sea, blessed by the
gods, ever famous in the sight of all’ (Lloyd-Jones, adapted). The tranquillity
of the island is foil to the coming description of grim war at Troy, as at
Eur. *Tro.* 799–800 μελισσοτρόφου Σαλαμῖνος ὦ βασιλεῦ Τελαμῶν, | νάσου
περικύμονος οἰκήσας ἔδραν (also beginning a choral ode). Here the evocation
of the island is especially poignant because it is the chorus’s homeland. An
Athenian audience would have regarded Salamis as περίφαντος because of
the defeat of the Persian fleet there in 480. But S. avoids repeating the famous
(and metrically equivalent) address ὦ θεῖη Σαλαμίς from the oracle given to
the Athenians before the Persian invasion (Hdt. 7.142.2).

For κλεινός of a place cf. 861, Sol. fr. 19.3 *IEG*, Stes. fr. 184.1 *PMGF* (these
last two of islands), Kienzle (1936) 89–90. For ναίω of a place cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.626

νήσων, αἱ ναίουσιν πέρην ἄλλος Ἥλιδος ἄντα, Leumann (1950) 194 (comparing οἰκέω at Phocylides fr. 8.2 West); also νοιετάω at e.g. Hom. *Il.* 4.45. που marks the chorus's emotional distance from their homeland after so many years away.

For Salamis 'lashed by the sea' cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 307 θαλασσοπληκτον νῆσον Αἶαντος. Dawe¹ writes ἀλίπληκτος for transmitted –πλακτος. Elsewhere in tragic lyric this suffix has e-vocalism (227/8–232n.); it would be extraordinary for S. to use both endings (as implied by Wilamowitz (1921) 509 n. 1), and so we should standardise this single anomalous instance. Most manuscripts have –αγκτος, but Salamis, unlike Delos, does not wander through the sea; for the error cf. Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.14(a) and (in reverse) 695, 1185/6.

For εὐδαίμων of a place cf. Kienzle (1936) 91. For the dative of judgment πᾶσιν see 437–40n. Triclinius restores πᾶσιν and αἰεί for πᾶσι and αἰί, typical Byzantine changes (cf. Pind. *P.* 11.23n., FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 675). αἰεί should be preferred to αἰί when (as here) we need a long first syllable. Before 450 Attic inscriptions have only αἰεί; from 450 to 400 both forms are found equally, while from 400 αἰί begins to dominate (Threatte 1 275–6).

599/600–605 ἐγὼ δ' ὁ τλάμων παλαιὸς ἀφ' οὗ χρόνος | Ἰδαῖα μίμων
λειμώνια †ποίῃ† μηνῶν ἀνήριθμος αἰὲν εὐνώμαι | χρόνῳ τρυχόμενος 'But I
in my wretchedness for an age now have been making my bed on the meadows
of Ida, as I wait, after a countless number of months, worn away by time.'
For the common soldier's complaints cf. the third stasimon (especially 1207–
1209/10), Aesch. *Ag.* 558–62 τὰ δ' αὐτὲ χέρσῳ καὶ προσῆν πλέον στύγος |
εὐναὶ γὰρ ἦσαν δαΐων πρὸς τείχεσιν, | ἔξ οὐρανοῦ δὲ κάπῳ γῆς λειμώνια
| δρόσοι κατεψάκαζον, ἔμπεδον σίνος, | ἔσθημάτων τιθέντες ἔνθηρον τρίχα,
Ar. Pax 345–56, especially 346–347b πολλὰ γὰρ ἀνεσχόμην πράγματά τε καὶ
στιβιάδας ἃς ἔλαχε Φορμίων, 353–4 ἴκανὸν χρόνον ἀπολλύμεθα.

For the adverbial parenthesis παλαιὸς ἀφ' οὗ χρόνος cf. *Phil.* 493–4 δν δὴ
παλαιὸν ἐξότου δέδοικ' ἐγὼ | μή μοι βεβήκη, Eur. *Hipp.* 908 οὐπω χρόνος
παλαιός [Lehrs: –ον –όν codd.] with Barrett, Platt (1911) 29, Fraenkel on
Aesch. *Ag.* 983 ff. παλαιός 'is often used of a period of time continuing from
long ago up to the present' (Barrett, *ibid.*), as at 622/3.

From here the text is uncertain. Working from the end, εὐνώμαι (*coni.*
Bergk (1851) 241) for manuscript εὐνόμα restores respension with a suitable
word (cf. εὐναί at *Ag.* 559, above). (Triclinius p. 14.4–10 Tessier secures the
former but not the latter goal by reading εὐνώμα, a *hapax* which he claims
is equivalent to εὐκινήτω.) The participle μίμων should be preferred over
μίμω; the need for a finite verb after the loss of εὐνώμαι will have encouraged
the corruption. Then manuscript Ἰδαίῃ must be reinterpreted as Ἰδαῖα (thus
Hermann *ap.* Lobeck¹) on metrical grounds; Bergk's Ἰδῆδι is metrical, but
the stem is unattested. ἀνήριθμος 'numberless' (contrast ἀναριθμητος 'of no
account', as at Eur. *Hel.* 1679, *Ion* 837) requires the change of μήλων to μηνῶν

(*coni.* Hermann¹, supposing corruption of N to Λ), giving a genitive after a negative compound adjective (cf. *Tr.* 247 ἡμερῶν ἀνήριθμον, *El.* 232 ἀνάρητος ὤδε θρήνων, 321–2n.). The association of Mount Ida with the pasturing of animals (cf. Anchises, Paris, and fr. 522 *TrGF* σὺ δ' αὖθι μίμνων που κατ' Ἰδαίαν χθόνα | ποιμένας Ὀλύμπου συναγαγὼν θυηπόλει) could also have led to the error. Cf. the earlier corruption of πημονάν to ποιμένων (359/60n.).

This leaves λειμωνία ποία. The required metre runs — ∪ ∪ — ∪; printing λειμώνια (thus Hermann *ap. Lobeck*¹; cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 560), which agrees with Ἰδαία, is a first step. Now we need a neuter plural noun to agree with both adjectives, scanning either ∪ — ∪ (if beginning with a vowel) or — ∪ (if with a consonant). (The range of possibilities is wider if we allow resolution, but this is rare in Sophoclean glyconics: Itsumi (1984) 77–8.) The phrase as a whole will be governed by εὐνῶμαι. Unfamiliarity with the construction (illustrated at 248/9–250n.) may have caused the erroneous intrusion of dative endings.

The best suggestion is ἔπαυλα (*coni.* Lobeck²); while it is redolent of fixed habitation (cf. *OR* 1138, of animals, and *OC* 668/9, of men), the irony would be appropriate. Campbell tries ὑπαιθρα, but elsewhere in tragedy this adjective appears as ὑπαιθριος. Jebb's appendix collects further conjectures.

χρόνω coming so soon after χρόνος (599/600) might conceal original πόνω (Martin; for the corruption cf. *OC* 1341, [Aesch.] *PV* 75) or δρόσω (Schneidewin²; cf. 1208–9, Aesch. *Ag.* 561), but Winnington-Ingram (1980) 33 n. 66 vindicates the paradosis as 'a characteristic Sophoclean accumulation of significant words' (cf. M. Heath (1987) 184). While claims of significant repetition should be treated with scepticism (*El.* 335–6n.), the build-up of terms (παλαιός . . . χρόνος, μηνῶν ἀνήριθμος, αἰέν, χρόνω) does seem remarkable.

606–607/8 κακὰν ἐλπίδ' ἔχων | ἔτι μέ ποθ' ἀνύσειν τὸν ἀπότροπον αἰδηλον Ἄιδαν. 'with the grim expectation that I will some time or other go to the abhorred, unseen Hades.' For ἐλπίζω, ἐλπίς of anticipated woe cf. 1382, *OR* 1432 ἐλπίδος μ' ἀπέσπασας, *El.* 1282n. For accusative με, instead of the expected nominative, with the infinitive see *El.* 65n. The minority variant ὅτι for ἔτι results from misreading of this construction. ἀνύω often describes the journey to death (690n.; MD cites *OC* 1562 (*coni.*), *Ant.* 805 (ἀνύτω), Eur. *Suppl.* 1141). Willink (2002) 57 n. 21 = (2010) 392 n. 21 restores the aspirate (cf. West's Teubner Aeschylus, p. xxx, Porson on Eur. *Phoen.* 463).

For the pair of negative adjectives (in effect a pair of alpha-privatives) see *El.* 164–5n. ἀπότροπον recurs in this sense ('from which one turns away') at *OR* 1313/14. αἰδηλος, a tragic *hapax*, is an epic word which in Homer and Hesiod always signifies 'making invisible', and hence 'consuming, destructive, abominable' (cf. N. Robertson (1969)). The juxtaposition with Ἄιδαν, the unseen god (Lloyd-Jones (1965) 242–3 n. 5 = (1990a) 399 n. 7, FJ/W on Aesch.

Suppl. 791) makes preferable the passive sense ‘unseen’ (cf. Wecklein (1911) 16–17).

609–11 καί μοι δυσθεράπτεος Αἴας ξύνεστιν ἔφεδρος, ὥμοι μοι, | θείᾳ μανίᾳ ξύναιλος. ‘And Ajax, hard to cure, sits nearby as my companion, *οἶμοι μοι*, dwelling with a god-sent sickness.’ δυσθεράπτεος (elsewhere in classical Greek only at Hippocr. *Medic.* 10) is ‘hard to cure’ rather than ‘incurable’, since the chorus are not completely without hope: they ‘take it as their function to apply such therapy as will restore him to a mood which is not suicidal’ (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 33).

The reference to sitting emphasises Ajax’s withdrawal from the war (see n. on 194a): ‘he ha[s] rejected the solicitations of his friends, and apparently returned to his sullen inaction within the tent’ (Campbell). For ἔφεδρος in this sense cf. Eur. *Tro.* 138–9 θάκουσ οἶους θάσσω, | σκηναῖς ἐφέδρους [Bothe: —ος codd.] Ἀγαμεμνονίαις. Elsewhere it can denote ‘one who sat by in a contest ready to take on the winner’ (Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 866–8): cf. Ar. *Ran.* 786–94 (where Sophocles is ἔφεδρος to Aeschylus and Euripides, ready to enter the fray if the latter wins), [Eur.] *Rhes.* 119 (Aeneas to Hector) νικῶν δ’ ἔφεδρον παῖδ’ ἔχεις τὸν Πηλέως, Eur. *Phoen.* 1095. This sense is preferred by the scholia (p. 145 Chr. πρὸς τοῖς πρώτοις κακοῖς ὥσπερ δεύτερον ἐστὶ μοι κακὸν τὸ τοῦ Αἴαντος ξυνεσθηκός). But Ajax’s relationship with the chorus could only be comprehensible in these terms if the chorus had first to overcome the physical discomforts of life at Troy, and only then to take on Ajax (or rather, we must presume, the grief which is the result of his malady). Alas, the chorus face not a consecutive, but a concurrent sentence: with no prospect of escaping from their dire situation at Troy, they must additionally endure the suffering caused by the lord’s madness and disgrace. Contrast the *Choephori* passage mentioned above, where the metaphor finds an exact fit; as Garvie writes, ‘Clytaemestra and Aegisthus together had won the earlier bout against Agamemnon. Now Orestes by himself is to engage the winners.’ Contrast also Philo *Flacc.* 72 μετὰ πάσας τὰς αἰκίας . . . ἡ τελευταία καὶ ἔφεδρος τιμωρία σταυρὸς ἦν, where the punishment designated ἔφεδρος explicitly follows the others and is separate from them.

For the orthography of ὥμοι μοι see 227/8–232n. Triclinius alone has ὥμοι μοι, while most manuscripts have ἰώ μοι μοι (some with an extra μοι). ὦ is often corrupted into ἰώ (372–3n.).

For ξύναιλος (< αὐλή ‘court’) in this sense cf. *OR* 1126. For ‘dwelling with’ an unpleasant abstract see *EL* 599–600n. The word can also mean ‘in harmony with’ (< αὐλός ‘pipe’), but despite the associations of that instrument with deviant mental states (cf. Aesch. fr. 57.2–5 *TrGF*, Eur. *Her.* 878–9, Diggle (1974) 11–13 = (1994) 101–4), we can hardly describe Ajax himself as ‘in harmony to madness’ (contrast Eur. *EL* 879 ξύναιλος βοᾷ χαρᾷ). Cf. 892n. on πάραυλος.

612/13–616/17 ὃν ἐξεπέμψω πρὶν δὴ ποτε θουρίῳ | κρατοῦντ' ἐν Ἀρεῖ· νῦν δ' αὖ φρενὸς οἰοβώτας φίλοις μέγα πένθος ἡῦρηται. 'whom you before sent out as a champion in furious warfare. But now, as he pastures his thoughts alone, he is found to be the cause of great grief to his friends.' νῦν δ' αὖ contrasts Ajax's past and present states, something 'idiomatic in the lamentatory context, and . . . often signalled by repeated use of a word for "now"' (in my n. on *El.* 1129–30 νῦν μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ὄντα βαστάζω χερσῖν, | δόμων δέ σ', ὦ παῖ, λαμπρὸν ἐξέπεμψ' ἐγώ, where as here present disaster is opposed to the past dynamic and hopeful moment of sending forth). But the phrase 'misses the real problem of Ajax: for he is the same man he was when he left Salamis, and his particular kind of "great soul" can only react to the given circumstances with this self-alienation' (Biggs (1966) 225; cf. 596–645n.). This will become clearer from Calchas' speech (748–83). δ' (omitted by the *Suda* ο 143 = iv 625.12 Adler) may be an interpolation, as often in this phrase (cf. West (1990) 263), but it is likely enough that both combinations were in use. θούριος is predicated of Ares at Eur. *Phoen.* 240, Gaetulicus *A.P.* 7.244.1 = 203 *FGE*, as is θούρος, at Eur. *Suppl.* 579, Hom. *Il.* 5.30 etc., Tyrt. fr. 12.34 *IEG*.

οἰοβώτας is corrupted to the unmetrical οἰοβότας in most manuscripts; for the error cf. *Phil.* 1148 (where metrically guaranteed οὔρεσιβώτας exists alongside a v.l. –βότας) and Eur. *Or.* 1000 (ἵπποβώτα Dindorf). οἰο– compounds are exclusively tragic and satyric in classical Greek: cf. *OR* 846 οἰόζωνος, Aesch. *Suppl.* 304 οἰοβουκόλος, 795 οἰόφρων, Eur. *Cycl.* 74, Tr. Adesp. fr. 242a *TrGF*. For βόσκω associated with mental processes cf. βουκολέω at Aesch. *Suppl.* 929 ἀβουκόλητον τοῦτ' ἐμῷ φρονήματι, *Ag.* 669 ἐβουκολοῦμεν φροντίσιν νέον πάθος, *Eum.* 78–9 τόνδε βουκολούμενος | πόνον, Hesych. β 908 (1338 Latte) βουκολήσομεν· μεριμνήσομεν, Sansone (1975) 27 ('the metaphor gives the picture of thoughts as docile grazing beasts located, apparently, in the *phrenes*. The individual is himself, presumably, the herdsman'). The use of feeding terminology to describe solitary mental anguish is paralleled by Hom. *Il.* 6.202 (Bellerophon) ὃν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ὀλεείνων (where see Stoevesandt); cf. also 625/6 φρενοβόρως.

ἡῦρηται (thus Dindorf³ for transmitted εὔρηται: 119–20n.) is a perfect passive (as implied by the γράφεται–variant γεγένηται, which will be in origin a gloss: 28n.); cf. *Ti.* 1075 νῦν δ' ἐκ τοιούτου θῆλος ἡῦρημαι τάλας, Aesch. *Pers.* 743 νῦν κακῶν ἔοικε πηγὴ πᾶσιν ἡῦρησθαι φίλοις. Alternatively, the verb is a perfect middle; but the sense ('has caused'), paralleled in the active at Eur. *El.* 650 εὕρισκεις δὲ μητρὶ πῶς φόνον;, leaves the middle voice unexplained.

Triclinius (p. 14.12–14 Tessier) advocates a series of metrical emendations (εὔ for δὴ, νικῶντ' εἰν for κρατοῦντ' ἐν, φρενός γ' for φρενός, and οἰοβότας for οἰοβώτας), all of which (except the last, which is obscure) aim to provide exact resonance with the strophe in syllables which we know to be anceps; none has intrinsic plausibility.

618–620/1 τὰ πρὶν δ' ἔργα χεροῖν | μεγίστας ἀρετᾶς | ἀφιλα παρ' ἀφίλοις
 ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε μελέοις Ἀτρεΐδαις. 'His former deeds of the highest valour have fallen, have fallen, without gaining friendship from the friendless, miserable Atreidae.' Ajax's past triumphs have come to nought because they were not rewarded with the arms of Achilles (thus Winnington-Ingram (1980) 34). Gardiner (1987) 65 n. 27 argues that 'the lines are as likely to be heard as a reference to the new and dangerous anger of the Atreidae at the attempted murder', but this has not been mentioned recently, and would only obscure the issue of ingratitude.

ἔργα χεροῖν effectively constitute a single noun (cf. Stes. fr. S54.1 *PMGF*; at 439 ἐμῆς makes a difference). Metrically essential μεγίστας and χεροῖν are presumably emendations by Triclinius for transmitted μέγιστ' and χερσί(ν). A reader could have taken the former with ἔργα rather than ἀρετᾶς, especially if the –ας ending was represented by an abbreviation; Triclinius also makes the latter change at 372.

For the predicative adjective with πεσεῖν cf. Aesch. *Ag* 998–9 εὐχομαι δ' ἔξ ἐμᾶς ἐλπίδος ψῦθη πεσεῖν ('I pray that from my expectation it may fall as a falsehood to the ground': Fraenkel). Immediate repetition of a single word, often with elision, is more characteristic of Euripides, as at Eur. *Or* 1547 ἔπεσ' ἔπεσε [*coni.* Seidler: ἔπεσεν ἔπεσε(ν) codd.], Diggle (1990) 116–17 = (1994) 388–9; but for Sophoclean examples cf. *Tr* 893 ἔτεκ' ἔτεκε [Schroeder: ἔτεκεν ἔτεκεν codd.], *OR* 1330/1 ὁ κακὰ κακὰ τελῶν ἐμὰ τάδ' ἐμὰ πάθεα, fr. 753 *TrGF* βαρὺς βαρὺς ξύνοικος, ὦ ξένοι, βαρὺς.

For the polyptoton ἀφιλα παρ' ἀφίλοις cf. 267 κοινὸς ἐν κοινοῖσι. For παρὰ with dative 'in the eyes of' cf. 924, *Tr* 589, Eur. *Hcl*d. 881, *El*. 1015, Bruhn §71.1. The nonsensical variant παρὰ φίλοις arose through incorrect word-division (177–8n.).

μέλεος 'wretched, miserable' is regularly predicated of someone suffering misfortune. In the vast majority of cases the speaker feels pity for that suffering, but the word can be used with indignation too (cf. *OR* 479 μέλεος μελέω ποδὶ χηρεύων, of the killer of Laius). Apparently only here does the adjective describe someone whom the speaker regards with indignation, but who can hardly be regarded as 'wretched'. Cf. δύσμορος in reproach at 1202/3–1203/4, Men. *Sam*. 69, 255, Theocr. 7.119 βάλλετ', ἐπεὶ τὸν ξεῖνον ὁ δύσμορος οὐκ ἔλεεῖ μεν, when more often it denotes someone wretched or miserable, either in pity (most cases) or indignation (cf. *OC* 804), and δύστηνος in the same sense (1290, Bond on Eur. *Her*. 1346). μέλεος means 'useless, idle' in Homer (cf. *Il*. 10.479–80 οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ | ἐστάμεναι μέλεον σὺν τεύχεσι), but that sense is not found in Attic, nor would it be right here.

622/3–625/6 ἧ που παλαιᾷ μὲν ἔντροφος ἡμέρα | λευκά τε γήρα μάτηρ νιν
 ὅταν νοσοῦντα φρενοβόρως ἀκούσῃ 'Perhaps his mother, living with her long

years, and white with old age, when she hears that he suffers from a sickness which consumes his mind'. Tecmessa first mentions the likely reaction of Ajax's mother to her son's suicide (507–9); so will Ajax himself just before his death (848–51). The description here is the most plangent of the three, as suits lyric; for a similar intensity cf. fr. 210.30–48 *TrGF*, Astyoche's lament for her dead son Eurypylos. The grief caused to parents by the deaths of their sons in war is a common topic in epic (see Griffin (1980), index s.v. 'parents, bereaved').

For ἡ πού see 176n. ἀμέρᾱ denotes the lifetime of Ajax's mother, which is παλαιά because it began long ago (599/600–605n.): cf. Eur. *Ion* 720 νέαν δ' ἀμέραν ἀπολιπὼν θάνοι and Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 105–6 for 'the idea that a man's lifetime is born, grows up, and ages with him'.

For ἔντροφος cf. *OC* 1362 σὺ γάρ με μόχθῳ τῷδ' ἔθηκας ἔντροφον ('you have made me live with this suffering'); some restore it at Eur. 661.22 *TrGF*, while ἐντρέφω ('raise, bring up') is attested in tragedy at Eur. *Ion*. 1428 and *Phoen.* 368. Nauck⁴ writes σύντροφος; for the sense cf. Eur. fr. 369.2 *TrGF* πολιῶ γήρᾳ συνοικῶν, and for the error (encouraged by preceding –εν) see 466–8n. Its appearance as a gloss in Zc hardly adds to its plausibility: it was natural to use the commoner Sophoclean word (cf. 639, 861, *El.* 1190, *Phil.* 171, 203) to explain the rarer.

For λευκός of old age cf. Eur. *Her.* 910 λευκὰ γήρᾳ σώματα, Tyr. fr. 10.23 *IEG*, Nicias *A.P.* 6.127.4 = 2762 *HE* λευκὸν . . . γῆρας. It appears with πολιός elsewhere (cf. Tyr. fr. 10.23 *IEG*, Anacr. (?) fr. 395.1–2 *PMG*, Reiter (1962) 58–9). λευκά (*coni.* Schneidewin¹ and (1849) 465) for transmitted λευκῶ improves the sense at minimal cost: 'rhetorically and poetically <it> is excellent, making it unnecessary for ἔντροφος to govern λευκῶι γήρᾳ as well as παλαιὰ ἡμέραι, and creating an attractive restatement of the same idea in different terms' (Dawe, *STS* 1 146). Corruption to the case of neighbouring γήρᾳ would have been easy. Jebb and Lloyd-Jones print the paradosis but translate the conjecture ('white with eld', 'white with the passage of time').

For coordinating μὲν . . . τε see Denniston 374–6. Denniston himself (p. 370) keeps the majority reading δέ, but his parallels all involve opposition between clauses, which is absent here (thus Dawe, *STS* 1 146–7).

φρενοβόρως for transmitted –μόρως (unmetrical v.l. –μώρως) is owed to Dindorf² (p. xi). μόρος in S., as in Aeschylus (Finglass (2006c) 263), always means 'death' (cf. 848). Hence the paradosis cannot be rendered 'sick with mind maddened by fate' (Bond on Eur. *Her.* 1024) or 'suffering from a calamity to the mind' (Jebb); 'deathly-minded' is more like it. φρενοβόρως is eminently suited to mental anguish: cf. Sappho fr. 96.16–17 Voigt ἡμέρῳ | λέπταν ποι φρένα κ[.]ρ . . . βόρηται, Aesch. *Ag.* 103 †τὴν θυμοβόρον [v.l. –φθόρον] λύπης φρένα†, Alcaeus fr. 70.10, West on Hes. *Op.* 799, Theogn. 1323–4 σκέδασον δὲ μερίμνας | θυμοβόρους, Hom. *Il.* 24.128–9 ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων | σὴν ἔδεται κραδίην, Hor. *C.* 1.18.4 with Nisbet and Hubbard, Diggle (1998) 196–7, West

(2007) 88. The reference to feeding also suits the imagery in φρενὸς οἰοβώτας above. Confusion between β and μ is a common minuscule error (cf. 877, *OC* 217, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 14).

627–33 αἴλινον αἴλινον | οὐδ' οἰκτρᾶς γόον ὄρνιθος ἀηδοῦς | ἦσει δῦσμορος, ἀλλ' ὄξυτόνους μὲν ᾠδᾶς | θρηνήσῃ, χερόπληκτοι δ' ἐν στέρνοισι πεσοῦνται | δοῦποι καὶ πολιᾶς ἄμυγμα χαίτας. 'in her wretchedness she will utter no Linus-song, nor the lament of the piteous bird, the nightingale – no, she will sound forth piercing cries, and blows struck by the hand will fall on her chest, and there will be rending of her grey hair.' Before αἴλινον we must understand οὐδέ, as advocated by a scholium (p. 149 Chr. ἀναστρεπτέον δέ· ἄρχει γὰρ τοῦ λόγου τὸ οὐ, ἴν' ἦ· οὐκ αἴλινον οὐδ' οἰκτρᾶς κτλ., *prob.* J. Powell (1932), Denniston 194, Kiefner (1964) 70–2); cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 532 Πάρις γὰρ οὕτε συντελῆς πόλις, Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 237, K–G II 291. The alternative has the woman uttering the *ailinos* and not the nightingale's cry: but 'the transition from positive to negative and then back to positive makes for obscurity' (Lloyd-Jones (1985) 16). Nor do we want to associate Ajax's mother with the Linus-song, the lament for the untimely death of Linus, son of Apollo and one of the Muses. αἴλινος occurs in tragedy (the word is repeated in the starred instances) at Aesch. *Ag.* 121*, 139*, 159*, Eur. *Her.* 348, *Hel.* 171b, 1164, *Or.* 1395*, *Phoen.* 1519, and in lyric at Pind. fr. 128c.6 S–M. Although a song of lament, it is quite different from the frenzied expressions of grief in which Ajax's mother will indulge (629/30–633). So at Eur. *Her.* 348–9 it is associated with Phoebeus, who is said to sing it ἐπ' εὐτυχίᾳ μολπῆ, 'after a song of good fortune'; at Hes. fr. 305.3 M–W πάντες μὲν θρηνεῦσιν (*sc.* τὸν Λῆνον) ἐν εἰλαπνίαις τε χοροῖς τε it is sung in a festal setting; and at Hom. *Il.* 18.561–72, the earliest reference to the song, a boy playing a lyre among a group of harvesters λῖνον . . . ὑπὸ καλὸν αἶδεν | λεπταλέῃ φωνῇ (570–1). Powell (1932) rightly rejects Jebb's attempt to characterise it as 'a loud, wild cry of grief, which for the Greeks had barbaric associations' (based on a misinterpretation of Eur. *Or.* 1395).

In myth Procne was turned into a nightingale after killing her son Itys, and the bird's song represented her lamentations for her dead child (*El.* 107n.). Poets drew attention to its beauty even when explicitly mentioning its mournful associations; so as with the Linus-song, the chorus present it as insufficiently wild to represent the depth of grief which Ajax's mother will experience. Thus the nightingale to whom Penelope in the *Odyssey* compares herself 'sings beautifully' (19.519 καλὸν αἶδησιν); in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan* the bird θρήνον ἐπιπροχέουσα χέει μελίγηρυν ἀοιδὴν (18); at Eur. *Hel.* 1107–1121 (where see Kannicht) the chorus ask for the nightingale, τὰν ἀοιδόταταν | ὄρνιθα μελωδὸν | ἀηδόνα δακρυόεσσαν, to come as a θρήνων . . . ξυνεργός; cf. also Nicomachus Alex. 127 F 13 *TrGF* μέλπουσι . . . ἀηδόνιον | κλαγγήν. Most

remarkably, at Aesch. *Ag.* 1146–9 Cassandra presents the nightingale’s state as one of felicity in comparison with her own: ἰὼ ἰὼ λιγείας μόνον ἀηδόνος [Hermann: ἀηδόνος μόνον codd.: ἀηδοῦς μόνον Dobree]· | περὲβαλον γάρ οἱ πτεροφόρον δέμας | θεοὶ γλυκύν τ’ αἰῶνα κλαυμάτων ἄτερ· | ἔμοι δὲ μέμνει σχισμός ἀμφήκει δορί (‘The life of the little songstress . . . is full of mourning, it is true, but it is nevertheless a γλυκὺς αἰὼν; she does not utter cries of pain, since she was mercifully rescued at the last moment from the most terrible fate, death by the sharp blade’: thus Fraenkel, II 526, comparing our passage). Elsewhere the bird’s lamentations can be represented as loud and violent (cf. *Tr.* 962/3 προὔκλαιον, δξύφωνος ὡς ἀηδών), but their rejection in favour of violent expressions of grief, as well as their pairing with the milder Linus-song, indicates that this is not the sense here.

For οἰκτρός and related words of the nightingale see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1143; she both shows and receives pity (for Itys and for her fate respectively), and the adjective carries both senses. The genitive of ἀηδών is usually ἀηδόνος; only here in classical Greek is ἀηδοῦς certainly attested (*coni.* Aesch. *Ag.* 1146, cited above), but for the contracted form cf. vocative ἀηδοῖ at Ar. *Av.* 679 (also χελιδοῖ at 1411, Anacr. fr. 394a *PMG*, Simon. fr. 307.2 Poltera, Mnasalces *A.P.* 9.70.3 = 2657 *HE* (v.l.); accusative at Eur. *Med.* 1162 εἰκῶ, acc. plural at *Tr.* 1178 εἰκούς). A nominative ἀηδῶ exists κατὰ Μυτιληναίους, according to the scholia (p. 149 Chr.), but not in our texts of Sappho and Alcaeus (see Hamm (1958) 151). For ὄρνιθος specified by ἀηδοῦς see Dodds on Eur. *Ba.* 1024–6, Hoekstra on Hom. *Od.* 13.86–7.

Taking a different view, Lloyd-Jones (1985) 17 applies to this passage Alexiou’s distinction between ‘improvised laments directly inspired by the sorrow of the occasion’ and ‘formal lamentations at a special ceremony’, on the ground that ‘Eriboia will not merely cry out in immediate grief, as she might if only sickness were in question, but since she knows that this sickness is equivalent to death, she will institute a formal lamentation’ (p. 18). Nothing in the text supports this distinction. Ll-J/W reject it by implication five years later in their OCT, where they print σχήσει for ἥσει (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 4). With this change the whole of 627–33 describes the laments of Ajax’s mother: she will not hold back from the Linus-song or from the nightingale’s laments, and will also engage in self-beating and high-pitched mourning. For σχήσω of restraining lament cf. *El.* 223–4 οὐ σχήσω | ταύτας ἀγᾶς [Blaydes: ἄσας codd.], 375 ταύτην τῶν μακρῶν σχήσει γόων. The error is palaeographically plausible: one of the sigmas in ΑΗΔΟΥΣΣΧΗΣΕΙ could have been lost by dittography, and ‘emendation’ of the resulting χήσει to ἥσει would have followed thanks to the standard use of ἦμι to denote utterance (cf. 851, Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 563–4, *El.* 596n.). But as established above, denying the Linus-song and the nightingale’s lament to Ajax’s mother is not problematic. Moreover, if we follow Ll-J/W in attributing both of these to her, together with the

miscellaneous shouting and beating in 629/30–633, we force on the poor woman an unprecedented farrago of lamentatory genres. It is one thing to predicate interchangeable terms such as γόος and θρήνος of the same act of mourning (*El.* 104n.), quite another to mingle songs whose mythological backgrounds remain distinct (at least in this period: contrast *Heliod.* 5.2.6 ἥσθετο γυναικὸς λαθραῖόν τι καὶ γοερόν οἷον ἡρινῆς ἀηδόνας αἶλινον [*Commelinus*: αἶλινον etc. codd.] φῶδῃν ἐν νυκτὶ μυρομένης). The transmitted text, by contrast, presents these two different acts of lamentation as discrete possibilities rejected in favour of something more violent and uncontrolled.

Ajax's mother combines aural laments with physical self-beating: cf. *El.* 88–9n., *OC* 1608–9 οὐδ' ἄνιεσαν | στέρνων ἀραγμούς οὐδὲ παμμήκεις γόους, *Aesch. Suppl.* 69–71, *Pl. Phaedo* 60a ἐκείνην . . . ἀπὴ γόν τινες . . . βοῶσάν τε καὶ κοπτομένην. Displays of grief in response to a death often involve beating the breast (cf. fr. 523.2–3 *TGF*, *Eur. Trö.* 793–4, *Ant. Sid. A.P.* 7.711.8 = 555 *HE* τὸν Αἰδεῶ στερνοτυπῇ πάταγον [*Salmasius*: θάλαμον codd.]) and tearing the hair (cf. *Men. Heros* 4–5, *Dysc.* 673–4, *Ant. Sid. A.P.* 7.241.1–2 = 338–9 *HE*, by a mother; *Alexiou* (2002) General Index s.v. 'hair, tearing of'). Grey hair (here with λευκός: 622/3–625/6n.) symbolises the weakness of the old, and so is especially poignant in contexts of loss; cf. *Hom. Il.* 24.516 and contrast *Pind. O.* 4.25–7, *Dürbeck* (1977) 270–1.

As Long (1968) 77 points out, it is properly χεῖρες, not δοῦποι, which will fall; S. 'frequently makes abstract noun and epithet exchange places in lyric or ornate dialogue as a means of embellishing the style' (comparing *El.* 717, 1358; add 754). In this expression and in ἄμυγμα χαίτας, 'the physical part . . . , hand and hair, is subordinated to a verbal noun describing a physical effect' (p. 78).

For the vocalism of χερόπληκτοι see 596/7–598n. Weakly-attested στέρνοισι is metrically guaranteed over –οῖς. Restoring ἄμυγμα (*coni.* Bothe¹) for ἄμύγματα gives respension with 645; desire for exact parallelism with δοῦποι will have led to corruption. Triclinius keeps ἄμύγματα and adds γε between ἄτερθε and τοῦδε in 645, but the particle gives unnecessary emphasis and inferior metrical form.

ἄμυγμα and related words normally refer to skin-tearing (see the examples cited by Diggle (1973) 247 = (1994) 65) rather than hair-pulling, for which σπάραγμα might be expected (cf. *Eur. Andr.* 826); but for a metaphorical application cf. *Aesch. Pers.* 115 φρήν ἀμύσσεται φόβῳ.

634/5 κρείσσων παρ' Αἰδᾶ κεύθων ὁ νοσῶν μάταν 'The man uselessly sick is better hidden in Hades.' That is, 'his mother may well lament as for the dead, since the condition of her son is worse than that of the dead, sick as he is' (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 35, and cf. M. Heath (1987) 185 with n. 39; *pace* Burton (1980) 25, according to whom 'the sailors are convinced that he

must die'). For κρείσσων used personally cf. *OR* 1368 (the chorus to Oedipus) κρείσσων γάρ ἦσθα μηκέτ' ὦν ἢ ζῶν τυφλός, *Dion. Hal.* 6.9.4 κρείττων γάρ ἂν ἑαυτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις γένοιτο ὁ τοιοῦτος πολίτης ἀποθανών, and *Lobeck's n.* The variant κρέσσων may have been introduced as a Doric form, but Doricisation of the lyrics will hardly have gone as far as this.

παρ' for transmitted γάρ was tacitly conjectured by Elmsley' on *OR* 1354. As he writes at (1814) 365, bare Ἀιδᾶ could only stand for ἐν Ἀιδᾶ, whereas the correct Greek expression is ἐν Ἀιδου (in tragedy at 865, *Ant.* 654, 911, *El.* 463, 1342, *Aesch. Suppl.* 228, 416, *Ag.* 1528, *Eur. Hec.* 418, *Tro.* 445 (*coni.*), and standard elsewhere). παρ' Ἀιδᾶ is also frequent in tragedy (cf. *OR* 972, *Phil.* 861, *OC* 1572, *Eur. Med.* 1059, *Tro.* 588, *Her.* 145, 491), although absent from other genres. I have not found a secure archaic or classical parallel for Ἀιδᾶ 'in Hades'. The one possible instance is *Hom. Il.* 23.244 εἰς ὃ κεν αὐτὸς ἐγὼν Ἀιδι κεύθωμαι, but there κεύθωμαι is a late variant, inferior to the alternatives κλεῦθ— and κλεύσ—. *West* (2001b) 126 argues against it, both on the ground of prosodical deficiency and because 'to speak of being hidden away Ἀιδι would be out of line with Homeric usage' (he interprets Ἀιδι κλεύθωμαι as 'be subject to Hades'). Corruption of παρ' to γάρ (for which cf. *Phil.* 1337 (*coni.*) and (in reverse) *Eur. Her.* 1237) would be facilitated by scribal dislike of asyndeton; and γάρ is wrongly inserted at the beginning of a strophe elsewhere (706n.). Moreover, the sense of γάρ is problematic. Ajax's mother will lament because her son is νοσῶν φρενοβόρως, not because it is better for a man who is so sick to be dead; that latter statement marks a fresh departure, not an explanation of what precedes.

κεύθω is used in tragedy several times intransitively in the present and perfect, only of the dead (cf. *El.* 867, *Ant.* 911, *OR* 968, *Aesch. Sept.* 588, *Bruhn* §99). Assuming that these go back to κεύθωμαι at *Hom. Il.* 23.244 (thus *Wackernagel* (1916b) 164 with n. 2) requires the error to have entered the Homeric text as early as the fifth century; it is first attested in *Didymus*.

ὁ (*coni.* *Lobeck's*) for transmitted ἦ gives the line a clear subject, and δς (636/7) a clear antecedent, as well as providing the short syllable required for responsion with 622/3. The comparative will have prompted the corruption.

μάτην 'draws a contrast not with some more efficient form of insanity but with rational behaviour' (*Olson* on *Ar. Pax* 95 τί μάτην οὐχ ὑγιαίνεις;); for its delayed position see *El.* 792n.

636/7–637/8 δς εἰς πατρώας ἥκων γενεᾶς ἄριστος πολυπόνων Ἀχαιῶν 'he who in respect of his ancestral lineage was the noblest of the hard-toiling Achaeans' (*Lloyd-Jones*, adapted; cf. *Pearson* (1923) 24 'standing high among the Achaeans by reason of his ancestry'). εἰς is owed to *Lloyd-Jones* (1956) 112. Transmitted ἐκ 'cannot be right; we need not "from his family" but "with respect to his family"', and no parallel indicates that ἐκ πατρώας γενεᾶς could

mean this' (Ll-J/W, *So*). The emendation gives the required sense while also yielding a combination of two attractive idioms: ἥκω accompanied by an adverb and a genitive (cf. Eur. *Held.* 213 γένους μὲν ἥκεις ὥδε τοῖσδε 'This is your standing in kinship with these children', *El.* 751 πῶς ἀγῶνος ἥκομεν; 'How do we stand in the battle?' (both Kovacs), K–G I 382–3, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἥκω 2c, S–D II 132) and intensive εἰς with a superlative (cf. 1340, *Phil.* 1344–5 (both ἄριστος), *Tr.* 459–60, perhaps Eur. fr. 228.2 *TrGF*, Simon. eleg. fr. 19.1 *IEG*, Timocreon fr. 727.2–4 *PMG* ἐγὼ δ' Ἄριστείδαν ἐπαινέω | ἀνδρ' ἱερᾶν ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν | ἐλθεῖν ἕνα λῶστον, Anon. *A.P.* 12.90.6 = 3651 *HE*, Lucilius 564 Marx, Virg. *Aen.* 2.426, K–G I 28(f)). Unfamiliarity with both constructions, the apparent need to supply a suitable preposition with the genitives, and the presence of ἥκω in a context seemingly demanding the idea of motion from, encouraged the corruption, which is palaeographically easy (cf. *Tr.* 941).

ἄριστος is preserved in Zu and by Triclinius: οὕτω γὰρ εὐρέθη καὶ ἐν τινι τῶν παλαιῶν πάνυ (p. 15.11–14 Tessier). 'Since [Triclinius] does not hesitate to admit his deliberate alterations, there seems to be no reason for disbelieving him when he claims his reading as derived from an ancient book' (Pearson (1923) 17). We also find λείπει τὸ ἄριστος in some manuscripts as a gloss. (Zc also has ἄριστος, but in a later hand, and so probably from a Triclinian source: cf. O. Smith (1971–80) 36.) ἄριστα is in Livineius 'V'; both are in the scholia (p. 150 Chr.). Most manuscripts have nothing. ἄριστα would go more closely with ἥκω, ἄριστος with εἰς. The combination of the two idioms is easier with ἄριστος, since then εἰς . . . ἄριστος stands as it were for the adverbial expression needed to accompany ἥκων; while if we read ἄριστα, then εἰς is left isolated. Ll-J/W (*So*) prefer ἄριστα because it gives exact responsion, but the position is aniceps.

πολύπρονος can mean just 'experienced in war' (Aesch. *Pers.* 320, Eur. *Held.* 932 with Wilkins), but the additional nuance 'war-weary' is in place.

639–40 οὐκέτι συντρόφοις | ὀργαῖς ἔμπεδος, ἀλλ' ἐκτὸς ὁμιλεῖ. 'is no longer constant to his inherited temper, but dwells outside it.' The chorus's claim is 'untrue on the testimony of the Coryphaeus himself' (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 36, referring to 481–4); as earlier (612/13–616/17n.), they assume that Ajax's recent behaviour is an aberration, not something bound up with his true character. For σύντροφος cf. 622/3–625/6n. For the expression Jebb compares Eur. *Ba.* 331 οἶκε μεθ' ἡμῶν, μὴ θύραζε τῶν νόμων.

641/2 ὦ τλᾶμον πάτερ 'O wretched father'. Metre guarantees πάτερ over πατήρ, and so the adjective should probably be vocative too. In certain genres, especially epic, a nominative adjective is sometimes coupled with a vocative noun, or vice versa (cf. K–G I 48, S–D II 63, West on Hes. *Th.* 964, Richardson on *Hom. Hym.* 2.54, Moorhouse 23). But there is no good secure tragic example. 565 is a special case (n.). At Eur. *Andr.* 348 ὦ τλήμων ἄνερ the –ων is metrically

guaranteed, but ἄνερ is not: read ἀνήρ (Dindorf). The vocative adjective in *S. Tr.* 1112 ὦ τλήμων Ἑλλάς is metrically guaranteed, but Ἑλλάς is itself a vocative. At *Ant.* 572 read ὦ φίλταθ' Αἴμον (not Αἴμων). In [Aesch.] *PV* 90 West reads παμμήτωρ τε γῆ (thus M) rather than παμμήτορ τε γῆ; his preferred text fits better with ὦ δῖος αἰθήρ at the beginning of Prometheus' series of invocations. See also 903n.

641/2–643 οἶαν σε μένει πυθέσθαι | παιδὸς δύσφορον ἄταν 'how unbearable is the ruin of your son, which you are still to hear' (literally 'what unbearable ruin of your son does it remain for you to hear'). For exclamations beginning οἶος see 367n. For impersonal μένει LSJ⁹ s.v. 1 7 μένω cite Aesch. *Suppl.* 435, Eur. fr. 733.1 *TrGF*. For ἄτη with a personal genitive cf. 908/9, Stinton (1965) 72 = (1990) 71.

644–5 ἄν οὐπω τις ἔθρεψεν | αἰὼν Αἰακιδᾶν ἄτερθε τοῦδε. 'ruin which none of the Aeacids has ever endured before apart from him.' Ajax's Aeacid ancestry, implied at 387 (n.) and explicitly mentioned only here, usually connects him with Aegina, where the eponymous nymph bore Aeacus (father of Peleus and Telamon) to Zeus (cf. Kowalzig (2006) 89–90, Zunker (1988) 133–64, Burnett (2005) 13–28). (Hdt. 8.64.2 describes how in 480 the Greek fleet at Salamis summon Ajax and Telamon from Salamis, and send a ship to Aegina to bring Aeacus and the 'other Aeacids' from Aegina: perhaps a compromise between the two largest contingents, the Athenians and the Aeginetans, who both laid claim to Ajax?) This family connexion is absent from Homer, while for Pherecydes, Telamon was Peleus' φίλος, not brother (fr. 60 *EGM*; cf. Lorimer (1950) 182). It suits S.'s rhetorical purpose to evoke this ancestry, however, both at 387 (n.) and here: the comparison with the other Aeacids (presumably Achilles, Telamon, Peleus, and Aeacus himself) emphasises the uniqueness of Ajax's suffering, and fits a context where the focus is on the reaction of the previous generation to his misery. The chorus thus go beyond even Ajax's previous comparison between himself and Telamon alone (434–40n.).

αἰὼν elsewhere in *S.* means '(someone's) life' (cf. Degani (1961) 54; see further Davies on *Tr.* 2). It is sometimes personified, as at *Tr.* 34–5 τοιοῦτος αἰὼν εἰς δόμους τε καὶ δόμων | αἰεὶ τὸν ἄνδρ' ἔπεμπε λατρεύοντά τω, Eur. *Held.* 898–900 πολλὰ γὰρ τίκει Μοῖρα τελεσσιδώτερ' Αἰὼν τε Χρόνου παῖς. The expression οὐτις αἰὼν Αἰακιδᾶν ἔθρεψεν 'no life of the Aeacids has endured' stands for 'none of the Aeacids has had a life which endured'. δῖων instead of αἰὼν (*coni.* Bergk (1851) 244) would imply an uncial error (A for Δ), but the resulting sentence lacks the boldness of the paradosis. The scholia's paraphrase (p. 151 Chr.) τοιαύτην ἄτην, οἶαν οὐδεὶς πέπονθεν τῶν Αἰακιδῶν appears closer to Bergk's text; but the purpose of paraphrase is to explain and simplify difficult phrases, not repeat them.

For οὔπω ‘never before’ cf. 663, *El.* 403n. ‘Never yet’ would suggest that another Aeacid may encounter similar difficulties, whereas the emphasis should be on the special intensity of Ajax’s suffering. For τρέφω in this sense see 501–3n. For Triclinius’s γέ after ἄτερθε see 627–33n.

SECOND EPISODE (646–92)

646–92 Ajax’s entrance surprises the audience, who were probably expecting his imminent suicide (594–5n.). His speech takes up the entire scene, which contains no entrance or exit apart from his own: a rare occurrence (cf. Taplin (1977) 108–9, 301–2). No other speech is required. Ajax has apparently come round to the view of Tecmessa and the chorus; persuasion is no longer necessary, and Ajax gives his orders and goes before they can respond to his welcome news. The effect is to isolate the protagonist, even when he is supposedly giving way to his companions.

‘Apparently’, ‘supposedly’: Ajax has not changed his mind, as Tecmessa will come to realise (807–8), and as she later discovers for certain (891). What will the audience think? Since Ajax’s suicide is a standard element of the myth, there are four possibilities. (i) S. has fundamentally changed this standard element; Ajax has chosen to live, and will survive. (ii) The change is partial; Ajax has chosen to live, but will be executed or lynched by the army or its leaders. (iii) Ajax’s decision to live is sincere, but later events will cause it to change, and he will then kill himself. (iv) Ajax is lying, and still intends to kill himself. Of these, (i) is probably too extreme a change. But it would be a bold member of the audience who immediately ruled out (ii). Compare how in Sophocles’ *Oedipus Rex* Oedipus blinds himself after learning of his parentage, whereas in Euripides’ *Oedipus* the servants of Laius blind him, before they know his true identity (fr. 541 *TrGF*); or how Euripides makes Medea responsible for the killing of her children, which may well be an innovation. The playwright enjoys considerable freedom to shape the myth for his artistic purposes. Part of the dramatic effect of this scene springs from the audience’s appreciation of that freedom: they cannot be sure how this unexpected development will be resolved.

As Ajax’s speech progresses, attentive audience members may begin to suspect that (iv) is correct. (Cf. Hillgruber (2000) 19 with n. 44, for whom the audience is at first astonished, and gradually comes round to disbelief.) Although his surface message states that he will not kill himself (*pace* the scholars listed by Lardinois (2006) 214 n. 3, to whom add Burton (1980) 26–7, who perversely argue that Ajax tells the truth throughout and Tecmessa and the chorus misunderstand him), many of his utterances are capacious enough to allow a different interpretation to listeners open to the possibility that Ajax is being deceptive (650–2n. at the end, 652–3n., 654–6n., 657–9n., 660n., 690n.).

He thereby deceives without actually lying, and conveys the impression that he will avoid suicide while never stating as much.

This aspect of the speech culminates in 666–78, an extended *a fortiori* argument, in which Ajax declares that he will yield to the Atridae, just as winter does to summer, night to day, storm to calm, sleep to waking. The original topic, hierarchy, has itself yielded to that of alternation (cf. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 50; on the latter idea in S. more generally see Cairns (2006) 121–2 n. 11). In each of these alternations, ‘the power that yields is extinguished: the simultaneous presence of winter and summer, night and day, storm and calm, sleep and waking, is impossible. So, too, Ajax will “submit” by making way for his “superiors”’ (M. Heath (1987) 187–8). Hence while on the surface the comparison expresses Ajax’s determination to give way to his enemies and live, his choice of language suggests at a deeper level that he wants to die – that he cannot exist in the same world as his enemies. The beauty of the imagery picks up and expands an element of Ajax’s idiolect of which only traces were apparent before (558–9; cf. Buxton (2006) 17–18). For the combination of great poetry and deceit Stevens (1986) 329–30 compares the Paedagogus’ extraordinarily vivid speech in *Electra* (680–763), which is devoted to the telling of a lie; equally, he points out that ‘the sustained eloquence and imaginative sweep . . . do much (perhaps illogically) to enhance the aura of greatness with which Sophocles has invested this awesome and forbidding figure’ (p. 335). Alternation will also be a consequence of Ajax’s speech as well as its central theme: his followers will experience joy at his apparent change of mind, and then despair when they learn of his death.

Ajax enters from the skene.

646–7 ἀπανθ’ ὁ μακρὸς κἀναρίθμητος χρόνος | φύει τ’ ἀδηλα καὶ φανέντα κρύπτεται. ‘All things that are obscure are brought forth by long and uncountable time, and hidden again when they have been revealed.’ Word order and context emphasise the universality of change more than the power of time (M. Heath (1987) 186). For ‘long time’ cf. *OC* 617–18 ὁ μυρίος | χρόνος, *Ti* 246–7 τὸν ἄσκοπον | χρόνον . . . ἡμερῶν ἀνήριθμον (v.l.), *Hdt.* 5.9.3 γένοιτο δ’ ἂν πᾶν ἐν τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ. ‘All things’ are regularly the target of time’s activity: cf. 714, fr. 301.2 *TiGF*, *OR* 1213, *OC* 609, 1453–4, *Eur.* fr. 441, *Aesch.* fr. dub. 469, *Simon.* eleg. fr. 88 *IEG* ὁ . . . Χρόνος . . . | . . . πάντα ψήχει καὶ τὰ βιαιότατα, *Automedon A.P.* 11.326.1–2 = 1569–70 *GP* πάντα | ὁ χρόνος ἀλλάσσει, *Philip A.P.* 9.708.2 = 3016 *GP*, *Friedländer* (1938a) 117–19 = (1969) 234. φύει suggests the idea of Time as engenderer, illustrated for non-Greek literatures by West (1971) 28–36, (1983) 103–5. Time also reveals, as at fr. 918 *TiGF* πάντ’ ἐκκαλύπτων ὁ χρόνος εἰς <τὸ> φῶς ἄγει, *Theogn.* 967 τοῦτων δ’ ἐκφαίνει πάντως [–ων v.l.] χρόνος ἦθος ἐκάστου; MD compares Saxl (1936), especially 200 n. 1. For the antithesis between hiding and revealing cf. *Hor.*

C. 1.34.13–14 *insignem attenuat deus | obscura promens*, Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 815. Behind the expression with its antitheses lies the idea that a god, or godlike abstract, can do all things (Fehling (1969) 306).

Stobaeus' ποιῇ for φύει (1.8.23 = 1 97.15 W–H) shows substitution of a commoner word of similar shape and meaning (56–8n.). Herwerden on *OR* 132 prefers φαίνει, comparing *Phil.* 297 ἔφην' ἄφαντον φῶς; but the variation φύει . . . φανέντα is more subtle. For middle κρύπτομαι where the active might have been expected cf. *Tr.* 474.

648–9 κοῦκ ἔστ' ἄελπτον οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἄλίσκεται | χῶ δεινὸς ὄρκος χαῖ περισκελεῖς φρένες. 'Nothing is beyond expectation; the dread oath and the unflinching purpose can be overcome' (Lloyd-Jones). Cf. Archil. fr. 122.1 *IEG* χρημάτων ἄελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον | οὐδὲ θαυμάσιον (in response to an eclipse), Eur. fr. 761 *TrGF* ἄελπτον οὐδέν, πάντα δ' ἐλπίζειν χρεῶν; also 715–18, *Ant.* 388–9 βροτοῖσιν οὐδέν ἐστ' ἀπώμοτον. Ajax has taken no oath, but his attitude was so determined that it is scarcely an exaggeration to speak in such terms. Elsewhere in S. 'an emphatic statement or promise is elevated to the status of an oath later in the play' (Allan (2007) 246–7 n. 30, where Sommerstein compares 1232–3, *Ant.* 327–9 ~ 394, *OC* 1039–41 ~ 1145–7, *Tr.* 316–19 ~ 377–8; cf. *El.* 47n.). περισκελής 'very dry, hard' is applied to metal at *Ant.* 475 σίδηρον ὀπτὸν ἐκ πυρὸς περισκελῆ; it may thus ease the transition to the following comparison (thus Schneidewin).

The minority variant οὐκ for κοῦκ is an easy error, especially when the line begins a quotation (as in Stobaeus, where lines 648–9 are given as a fresh entry, not straight after 646–7); moreover, 'if κοῦκ were written with *scriptio plena*, the καὶ would have seemed hypermetric and otiose' (MLW). For the reverse mistake cf. 725; for errors involving crasis cf. 39n. χαῖ for transmitted καὶ is owed to Musgrave (he writes χαῖ: 188–90n.). The definite article is necessary for the generic sense ('unflinching purposes in general': 473–4n.).

650–2 κἀγὼ γάρ, ὃς τὰ δεινὰ ἐκαρτέρουν τότε | βαφῇ σίδηρος ὥς, ἐθελύθην στόμα | πρὸς τῇσδε τῆς γυναικός. 'For I too, who before was mightily steadfast like iron when it has been dipped, have been feminised in my mouth by this woman.' With these words 'a maxim applicable to all mankind is . . . applied by the speaker to himself' (Davies on *Tr.* 444; cf. 1266–70, West on Hes. *Op.* 11–46 and *El.* 696–7n., where the *gnome* occurs within a speech, not at its opening). The individual instance provides inductive proof for the general statement: hence γάρ (cf. Denniston 66–7). Repetition of language and thought binds the individual to the general statement (τὰ δεινὰ ~ δεινός, ἐκαρτέρουν ~ περισκελεῖς).

καὶ γάρ introduces inductive proof (cf. 669, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1040, *id.* (1957) 185–6). τὰ δεινὰ (312–13n.) is adverbial ('in that terrible, powerful, way

with which you are familiar’). τότε denotes ‘a past occasion previously brought to [the audience’s] attention’ (*El.* 278n.): cf. 1240, Diggle (1994) 492 n. 10. The variant ἐπηπείλῃς’ ἔπη (for ἑκαρτέρουν τότε) is probably a reminiscence of 312 (there too preceded by τὰ δειν’).

The hardness of iron metaphorically describes character at Hom. *Il.* 22.357 and 24.205. Hot iron is hardened when dipped in water (cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.391–3 ὥς δ’ ὅτ’ ἀνὴρ χαλκεὺς πέλεκυν μέγαν ἤε σκέπαρνον | εἶν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βάπτῃ μεγάλη ἰάχοντα | φαρμάσσων· τὸ γὰρ αὐτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστίν, Forbes (1950) 412–14); hence βαφῇ σιδήρος ὥς goes with what precedes, and ὥς should be followed by a comma (thus Σ pp. 153–4 Chr.). The alternative view, according to which the comma should be placed after τότε, takes βαφῇ σιδήρος ὥς with ἐθελύνθην στόμα. This relies on a claim in the scholia that iron is softened when dipped in oil (p. 154 Chr.). In fact, this hardens the metal without making it brittle (cf. Plut. *De Pr. Frig.* 950c, Plin. *NH* 34.146, Jebb’s appendix, p. 230, D. Müller (1974) 152–3). Moreover, the idea of dipping metal in water is so fundamental to metalworking that any other liquid would need a specific mention. (A simile from the softening of iron was at hand if S. had wanted it: cf. Pl. *Leg.* 666b ὥστε . . . γίγνεσθαι μαλακώτερον ἐκ σκληροτέρου τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἦθος, καθάπερ εἰς πῦρ σίδηρον ἐντεθέντα γιγνόμενον, *Resp.* 411a.) For the word order cf. *Tr.* 441–2 Ἔρωτι μὲν νυν ὅστις ἀντανίσταται | πύκτης ὅπως ἐς χεῖρας, οὐ καλῶς φρονεῖ, where see Davies for further parallels. Dawe (1988) 104 = (2007) 142 objects that ‘the long process described in the imperfect ἑκαρτέρουν cannot be compared with the once-and-for-all immersion of iron into liquid’. But Ajax is comparing his previous state not to iron at the moment of dipping, but to iron which has been dipped and is therefore hard. The brief, verbless, perhaps proverbial phrase βαφῇ σιδήρος ὥς (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1316 (III 612–13), Bond on Eur. *Her.* 510) is consistent with his self-description.

ἐθελύνθην στόμα continues the metalworking image; for στόμα ‘blade’ cf. Hom. *Il.* 15.389, Eur. *Suppl.* 1206 δξύστομον μάχαιραν with Collard, Ar. *Nub.* 1108 στομώσεις, LSJ⁹ s.v. III 1a. The verb has its full metaphorical force, especially because of the remarkable shift in metaphor from that distinctively masculine activity, metalworking (cf. Clytemnestra’s womanly protestation at Aesch. *Ag.* 611–12 οὐδ’ οἶδα τέρψιν οὐδ’ ἐπίπογον φάτιν | ἄλλου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς μᾶλλον ἢ χαλκοῦ βαφάς, where see Fraenkel). By saying that he has been ‘feminised’, Ajax means that he will act on the basis of what he sees as feminine virtues, such as pity (580n.) and obedience. In place of στόμα we might have expected φρένα (so Perrotta (1935) 153 n. 1), since the change which Ajax describes is one of attitude; but it is manifested in his language. At another level, Ajax’s attitude has *not* changed: only his language has.

652–3 οἰκίτῳ δέ νιν | χήραν παρ’ ἐχθροῖς παῖδά τ’ ὀρφανὸν λιπείν. ‘I feel pity at leaving her a widow among my enemies, and my child an orphan.’ Ajax

refers to Tecmessa's words at 490–505 and 510–19. Pity is for him a feminine virtue (580n.); the audience cannot tell if the reference to it here is part of the deception or not. For the infinitive with οἰκίρω (thus Nauck⁸ for transmitted οἰκτείρω: 121–2n.) cf. Hom. *Od.* 20.202–3 οὐκ ἑλεάρεις ἄνδρας . . . | μισγέμεναι κακότητι καὶ ἄλγεσι λευγαλίοισιν; the conjecture λιπών (Blaydes¹) gives the wrong sense ('I feel pity that I have left her'). The implication is that Ajax's pity will prevent him from acting in this way, but he does not say this in so many words.

654–6 ἀλλ' εἰμι πρὸς τε λουτρὰ καὶ παρακτίους | λειμώνας, ὥς ἂν λύμαθ' ἄγνισας ἐμὰ | μῆνιν βαρεῖαν ἐξαλέξωμαι θεᾶς. 'But I shall go to the bathing-place and meadows by the shore, so that by cleaning off the dirt upon me I may ward off the heavy anger of the goddess.' Ritual purification could be effected by bathing, whether in the sea (cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.312–14, Eur. *IT* 1191–3, Hippocr. *Morb. Sacr.* 4, Theophr. *Char.* 16[.14], Cat. 88.5–6) or in rivers (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 159–60, where Alcestis washes with river water on the morning of her death; also *OR* 1227–8 οἶμαι γὰρ οὐτ' ἂν ἴστρον οὐτε Φᾶσιν ἂν | νίψαι καθαμῶ τήνδε τὴν στέγην, Aesch. *Cho.* 72–4): 'dirtiness and divine intervention . . . [are] both . . . external intrusions upon the integrity of the body' (R. Parker (1983) 217). But washing a corpse is also an essential preparation for burial (1404–6, *Ant.* 1201 λούσαντες ἄγνὸν λουτρόν, *El.* 1139n.).

For the position of τε see 53–4n. For 'heavy anger' see 41n. μῆνις usually denotes divine wrath, as at 757 (though at *OC* 1328 Polynices uses the phrase to describe Oedipus' anger against his sons): it is 'largely reserved for the gods, heroes, and the dead . . . I hazard a guess that it is the gravity and intensity of *mēnis* that makes it suitable as a term both for divine wrath and for human anger which exceeds the norm' (Cairns (2003) 32; see further pp. 31–3).

ἐξαλέξωμαι is owed to West (1977) 266 n. 7; cf. on Hes. *Op.* 363, (1978a) 111–12. *O^{ac}Δ* have ἐξαλέξωμαι, and *A* has what appears to be a xi above the sigma of ἐξαλεύσωμαι, the reading which it shares with the other Sophoclean manuscripts. A third variant, ἐξαλύξωμαι, found in Hesychius ε 3546 (π 117 Latte) ἐξαλύξωμαι φυλάξωμαι. Σοφοκλῆς Αἴαντι Μαστιγοφόρῳ, is advocated by Wesseling (1727) 162–3. ἀλεύω is attested for *S.* at fr. 269d.17 *TrGF* ἄλξουσμεν (*Inachus*, probably a satyr-play) and fr. 993 ἀλεύσω (defined as φυλάξω). Aeschylus uses the aorist active ἤλευσα, while the aorist middle ἤλευσάμην occurs in epic; but ἤλευσάμην (presupposed by (ἐξ)αλεύσωμαι) is not found elsewhere. ἀλύσκω is attested for *S.* at *El.* 627 and *Ant.* 488 (both future active), while the aorist active is common in Homer and tragedy; but the middle is unparalleled. ἀλέξω, ἀλέξασθαι, on the other hand, is Sophoclean (165–6n.). West cites two parallels for the corruption of parts of this verb to parts of ἀλύσκω; the Hesychius quotation could be a corruption from original ἐξαλέξωμαι. Since both ἐξαλεύσωμαι and ἐξαλύξωμαι are unparalleled forms, and a typically Sophoclean verb is to hand at the price of a small emendation,

West's text should on balance be preferred. Ll-J/W, *Sa.* defend ἐξαλύσωμαι on the ground that “escape” suits the context somewhat better than “ward off” does; if anything, the opposite is true, since ‘warding off’ the goddess’s anger better parallels the physical removal of the bloodstains.

Dawe³ prints ἐξιλεύσωμαι, found in H^{pc}, an otherwise unattested version of ἰλάσμαι with inappropriate sense (Ajax wants to get rid of Athena’s anger together with the blood, not to propitiate it). As West (1978a) 112 points out, the reading of H^{pc} is merely an attempted emendation of ἐξελεύσωμαι, itself a corruption of ἐξαλεύσωμαι.

657–9 μολών τε χῶρον ἐνθ’ ἄν ἀστιβῆ κίχῳ | κρύψω τόδ’ ἔγχος τοῦμόν, ἐχθιστον βελών, | γαίης ὀρύξας ἐνθα μή τις ὄψεταί· ‘I will go where I can find some untrodden spot, and hide this sword of mine, most hateful of weapons, after digging a place in the ground where no one will see it.’ The sword will indeed be hidden, but in his body (898–9), not in the ground. Sicherl (1970) 36 n. 3 ≈ (1977) 96 n. 122 compares Eur. *Suppl.* 1205–9, where Athena orders a sacrificial knife to be buried to protect against future invasion (cf. *El.* 484–5n.); the burial here may thus continue the ‘perverted sacrifice’ theme (218–19n.).

For ‘untrodden ground’ cf. fr. 558 *TrGF* ἀποσσιβῆς, *OC* 39 (χῶρος) ἄθικτος οὐδ’ οἰκητός (the grove of the Eumenides), *Phil.* 1–2 ἀκτὴ... | ... βροτοῖς ἀστιπτος οὐδ’ οἰκουμένη (Lemnos); the description suits the emphasis on Ajax’s loneliness (29–31n.). For ἔγχος ‘sword’ see 95n. For expressions in *S.* similar to ἐνθα μή τις ὄψεταί see *El.* 436n. The partitive genitive γαίης ὀρύξας (cf. K–G 1 345, Moorhouse 59–60) is supported by the ἐνθα clause, as if accompanied by an antecedent πού (Campbell); cf. *Phil.* 1180–1 ἴωμεν ἴωμεν | ναὸς [λαὸς Dawe] ἵν’ ἡμῖν τέτακται ‘let us go to the part of the ship appointed for us’.

660 ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ Νύξ Ἄιδης τε σφζόντων κάτω. ‘But let Night and Hades keep it safe below.’ Hades has every interest in preserving the weapon with which Ajax will kill himself. Editors print νύξ, but the personification is clear enough; Willink on Eur. *Or.* 1225–6 adopts the capital. For the irony and the expression cf. *El.* 437–8 ἀλλ’ ὅταν θάνῃ, | κειμήλι’ αὐτῇ ταῦτα σφζέσθω κάτω (Electra urges Chrysothemis to dispose of offerings sent by Clytemnestra to Agamemnon). For the association of Night with death and Hades cf. Hes. *Th.* 211–12 Νύξ δ’ ἔτεκε στυγερόν τε Μόρον καὶ Κῆρα μέλαιναν | καὶ Θάνατον, Ar. *Av.* 693 Χάος ἦν καὶ Νύξ Ἑρεβός τε μέλαν πρῶτον καὶ Τάρταρος εὐρύς, Anyte *A.P.* 7.232.3 = 748 *HE* δόμον... νυκτός (of Hades), Ant. Sid. *A.P.* 7.241.11–12 = 348–9 *HE*; for the Underworld and darkness see 394a–395n.

661–3 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐξ οὗ χειρὶ τοῦτ’ ἐδεξάμην | παρ’ Ἑκτορος δῶρημα δυσμενεστάτου, | οὐπω τι κεδνὸν ἔσχον Ἀργείων πάρα. ‘For ever since I received this gift in my hand from Hector, my greatest enemy, I have never to this day experienced anything good from the Argives.’ At the end of their duel

in *Iliad* 7, Ajax and Hector exchange gifts (303–5): ὧς ἄρα φωνήσας δῶκε ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον, | σὺν κολεῷ τε φέρων καὶ ἐντμήτῳ τελαμῶνι· | Αἴας δὲ ζωσπῆρα δίδου φοίνικι φαεινόν. Ajax could be on good terms with an enemy in the past, but no longer regards such courtesies as permissible (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 19); cf. how in the *Iliad* the practice of prisoner-taking existed in earlier stages of the conflict, but not during the fighting in the poem itself (Finglass (2006b) 188 with n. 7). Ajax mentions the exchange of gifts again at 817–18, as does Teucer at 1024–7. For οὐπω ‘never’ rather than ‘never yet’ see 644–5n. κεδνός in archaic and classical Greek is only poetic.

664–5 ἀλλ’ ἔστ’ ἀληθής ἡ βροτῶν παροιμία, | ἐχθρῶν ἄδωρα δῶρα κοῦκ ὀνήσιμα. ‘But the saying of men is true: the gifts of enemies are evil gifts and bring no benefits.’ For the thought cf. Eur. *Med.* 618 κακοῦ παρ’ ἀνδρὸς δῶρ’ ὀνησιν οὐκ ἔχει, Ar. *Vesp.* 1159–60, Men. [*Sent.*] 166 ἐχθροῦ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς οὐδὲν ἔστι χρήσιμον, Virg. 2.49 *timeo Danaos et dona ferentis*, CPG 1 245, II 69, Tosi (1991) 112–13, West (2007) 362–3. For the pejorative alpha-privative in the oxymoron ἄδωρα δῶρα (cf. the paraphrase of Eustathius 682.44 = II 466.14–15 Van der Valk, τὸ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους εἰπεῖν, δύσδωρα τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα) see *El.* 1154n., adding Eur. fr. 869 *TrGF* ἄδωρος χάρις, Wackernagel (1926–8) II 290–1 = (2009) 764–5.

666–7 τοιγὰρ τὸ λοιπὸν εἰσόμεσθα μὲν θεοῖς | εἴκειν, μαθησόμεσθα δ’ Ἀτρείδας σέβειν. ‘Therefore in the future we will find out how to yield to the gods and learn how to respect the Atridae.’ τοιγὰρ (found in Homer and drama, never in Attic prose: Denniston 565–6) connects the statement not with what immediately precedes, but with Ajax’s initial statement announcing his change of mind (646–53; thus M. Heath (1987) 187). L’s Ἀτρείδα gives a dual common in epic but unattested in tragedy except for Eur. *IT* 898, where it is accompanied by δυοῖν (1304–7n.), and denotes Orestes and Iphigenia (Cuny (1906) 134, Wackernagel (1916a) 217 = (1916b) 57; contrast Eur. *Hec.* 122 τῷ Θησεΐδῃ). For parallels for the rhyme εἰσόμεσθα . . . μαθησόμεσθα see Norden (1909) II 833 n. 1.

σέβω with a human object denoting respect is unexceptionable: cf. Eur. fr. 337.2 *TrGF* σέβειν δὲ τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἀρχαῖος νόμος and the examples cited by Bain *ap.* Taplin (1979) 128 with n. 19, such as *OR* 700. The view that Ajax sarcastically expresses excessive, quasi-religious reverence for the Atridae (Σ p. 155 Chr. ἐπιφθόνως ἔφρασεν, ἐν εἰρωνείᾳ ἀντιστρέφας τὴν τάξιν. ἔδει γὰρ εἰπεῖν θεοὺς μὲν σέβειν, εἴκειν δὲ Ἀτρείδαις; cf. Eustathius 20.21 = I 35.1–2 Van der Valk, Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 883, Perrotta (1935) 152–3) mistakenly restricts the semantic range of the verb. Acknowledging the wider sense of σέβω, M. Heath (1987) 187 with n. 46 nevertheless argues that the incongruity arises from the juxtaposition, on the ground that ‘the reverse pairing would be natural’; but there is a good tragic parallel (cited above) for σέβω used of one’s rulers.

668 ἄρχοντές εἰσιν, ὥσθ' ὑπεικτέον. τί μὴν; 'They are the leaders, so one must yield to them. Of course!' Sophocles' protagonists are normally reluctant to yield (371n.). For the form cf. *OR* 1460–1 ἄνδρες εἰσίν, ὥστε μὴ | σπάνιν ποτέ σχεῖν, ἔνθ' ἄν ὥσι, τοῦ βίου. Strongly affirmative τί μὴν; is restored by Linwood¹ for transmitted τί μή; or τιμῇ (for the corruption see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 672). τί μὴν; means 'what else?' (cf. Denniston 333), from which it develops to a strong affirmative, as at Aesch. *Suppl.* 999, *Ag.* 672 (*coni.*), *Eum.* 203, Ar. *Ach.* 757, 784 (both σά μάν, in Megarian), and often in Plato (Dittenberger (1881) 334–5 with n. 3). (LL-J/W wrongly introduce another example at *OC* 1468 by adopting Blaydes's punctuation; they claim in *Sō.* that it is 'practically equivalent to an emphatic affirmation', but in his Loeb Lloyd-Jones translates 'What can this be?', which is unparalleled.) τί μὴν οὐ; has the same sense at *El.* 1280 (*coni.*), [Eur.] *Rhes.* 706.

If we keep τί μὴν;, we must either (i) assume that both τί μή; and τί μὴν; were in use in tragedy with the same meaning or (ii) emend all instances of τί μὴν; to τί μή;. Since μὴν is corrupted into μή at *El.* 1280, it is better to regard *Aj.* 668 and Aesch. *Ag.* 672 as further examples of the same corruption than evidence for a combination otherwise unattested in classical Greek.

669–70 καὶ γὰρ τὰ δεινὰ καὶ τὰ καρτερώτατα | τιμαῖς ὑπέικει. 'For even the terrible and the most powerful yield to prerogatives.' For καὶ γὰρ see 650–2n. Instead of δεινὰ Wilamowitz (1879) 176 = (1935–72) IV 12 suggests θεῖα from the scholium εἰ γὰρ τὰ θεῖα ὑπέικει τιμῇ, πόσῳ μᾶλλον προσήκει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ταῦτα πράττειν (p. 156 Chr.), but δεινὰ is at home in this speech (649, 674). He implicitly abjures the conjecture in his text at (1924b) 249 = (1935–72) IV 343.

670–1 τοῦτο μὲν νιφοστιβεῖς | χειμῶνες ἐκχωροῦσιν εὐκάρπῳ θέρει. 'Winters in which one treads on snow make way for summer, rich in crops.' The asyndeton is explanatory. τοῦτο μὲν followed by (τοῦτο) δέ (etc.) appears in drama at *Ant.* 61, 165, *Phil.* 1345, *OC* 440, Ar. *Eq.* 520; common in Herodotus and Antiphon, absent from Thucydides, and rare in fourth-century prose (cf. Dover (1997) 95), it is probably an unremarkable usage which gradually falls out of fashion. For the alternation of the seasons MLW compares Lyr. Adesp. fr. 37.5 *CA*, Hor. *C.* 4.7–12. The sense of νιφοστιβεῖς χειμῶνες is given by W. Barrett (2007) 323–4 n. 2. Compounds in –στιβής (< στείβω 'walk') are first attested in Aeschylus, and then in S. and Euripides (see Fries on [Eur.] *Rhes.* 763b–764a); they are very rare in prose. They show the wide semantic range typical of compound adjectives identified by Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 677–9. So *OR* 301 (οὐράνιά τε καὶ) χθονοστιβῆ means 'things that walk the earth', and Aesch. *Pers.* 127 πεδοστιβῆς λέως, 'the host which treads the earth'; while Eur. fr. 670.3 *TrGF* οὐ πεδοστιβῆς τροφός means 'a nurse not trodden by feet' (i.e. the sea), Aesch. *Eum.* 76 τὴν πλανοστιβῆ χθόνα, 'the earth you tread in your

wanderings’ (thus Lloyd-Jones), and *Cho.* 768 μονοστιβής, ‘walking on one’s own’. Barrett’s translation exploits this semantic malleability to give the most natural meaning. The common rendering ‘winters with snowy paths’ derives the adjective from the noun στίβος ‘path’, but the other such compounds all have a verbal element; the one parallel for this sense, ἡλιοστιβείς at [Aesch.] *PV* 791, is normally emended to ἡλίου στίβει to supply a necessary verb. Another alternative, ‘storms that range over snow’, gives the –στιβ– element too energetic a sense.

672–3 ἐξίσταται δὲ νυκτὸς αἰάνης κύκλος | τῇ λευκοπώλῳ φέγγος ἡμέρα φλέγειν ‘Night’s dread sphere makes way for white-horsed day to blaze forth its light.’ The alternation of day and night is a fundamental principle of a just and ordered universe: cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 543–5 νυκτὸς τ’ ἄφεγγές βλάφαρον ἡλίου τε φῶς | ἴσον βαδίζει τὸν ἐνιαύσιον κύκλον, | κοῦδέτερον αὐτῶν φθόνον ἔχει νικώμενον (with Mastronarde, citing Presocratics and Hippocrates). For the verb in this context cf. Eur. *Her.* 104 ἐξίσταται γὰρ πάντ’ ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων δίχα (‘the language is that of physical speculation about the universe’: Bond, with references).

κύκλος denotes the night sky (MLW compares Hdt. 1.131.2 τὸν κύκλον πάντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), and may suggest the cycle of days and nights (cf. *El.* 1365 πολλὰ κυκλοῦνται νύκτες ἡμέραι τ’ ἴσαι). αἰάνης can mean either ‘grim’ or ‘long-lasting’ (cf. Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.236(a), Degani (1962) 45 = (2004) II 825); the former is appropriate. For the accentuation see *El.* 506n.

Day is λευκόπῳλος at Aesch. *Pers.* 386, λευκόπεπλος at Hippon. fr. 47.1 *IEG*, λευκόπτερος at Eur. *Tro.* 847. Dawn is λευκόπῳλος at Tr. Adesp. fr. 688.1 *TrGF*, λευκίππος at Bacchyl. fr. 20c.22 S–M, Theocr. 13.11. Night’s horses are correspondingly dark (cf. Aesch. fr. 69.6–7 *TrGF* μελανίππου . . . | . . . νυκτός). The chariot and horses of the Sun first appear in Mimnermus (fr. 12 *IEG*; cf. Theogn. 997–8, Diggle on Eur. *Pha.* 2, Olson on Ar. *Pax* 406, West (1997) 507–8, (2007) 203–7), Dawn’s πῳλοι at Hom. *Od.* 23.246 (cf. West (2007) 223); neither text specifies colour. More generally, white horses were often attributed to gods and heroes (*El.* 706n.).

674–5 δεινῶν δ’ ἄημα πνευμάτων ἐκοίμισε | στένοντα πόντον ‘The blowing of terrible winds lulls to sleep the moaning sea.’ ‘Winds were commonly said to calm the sea, presumably by relaxing their force on it’ (Coleman on Virg. *Ed.* 2.26); cf. Bacchyl. 13.129–30 στόρεσεν δὲ τε πό[ντον] οὐρία, Virg. *Aen.* 3.69–70 *placata* . . . *venti* | *dant maria*, 5.763 *placidi straverunt aequora venti*, Hor. *C.* 1.3.14–16. Alternatively, calm seas resulted from the absence of the wind: cf. Hom. *Od.* 5.391–2 = 12.168–9, Virg. *Ed.* 9.57–8, Diggle (1994) 431 with n. 46. It is at first sight odd to predicate δεινός of winds which lull the sea to sleep: hence conjectures such as λῆγον (F. Schmidt (1864) 9–10), λείων (Jacobs (1786) 10–11), and δίων (Meineke (1863) 280–1, citing Eur. *Hel.* 2, Hor. *CS* 32). But

δεινῶν gives an attractively compressed statement of the changeability of the winds (cf. Eur. *Her.* 102 πνεύματ' ἀνέμων οὐκ αἰεὶ ῥώμην ἔχει, Solon fr. 13.18–24 *IEG*, Pind. *P.* 3.104–5 ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλοῖσι πνοαί | ὑπὶ πετᾶν ἀνέμων): winds which at one moment are terrible, at another bring calm to the ocean. The variant δεινόν assimilates the adjective to the case of the neighbouring noun; we could hardly take it with πόντον.

For κοιμίζω, κοιμάω with the sea as its object cf. Hom. *Od.* 12.169 κοίμησε δὲ κύματα δαίμων, Philip *A.P.* 9.290.8 = 2958 *GP* θάλασσαν ἀγρίαν ἐκοίμισαν (sc. οἱ δαίμονες); also (for the metaphor) Aesch. *Ag.* 565–6, Simon. fr. 271.20–1 Poltera εὐδέτω δὲ πόντος. For στένω of the sea cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.229–30 οἱ δ' ἄνεμοι πάλιν αὖτις ἔβαν οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι | Θρηϊκίον κατὰ πόντον· ὁ δ' ἔστενε νῆματι θυῶν, Eur. *Her.* 861 πόντος . . . κύμασι στένων λαβρός, Virg. *Aen.* 3.555–6 *gemitum ingentem pelagi pulsataque saxa | audimus*, Hor. *C.* 2.20.14; also *Ant.* 590/1–592 δυσάνεμοι | στόνῳ βρέμουσιν ἀντιπλήγες ἄκται.

δ' is owed to Erfurd (tacite) for transmitted τ'; this statement parallels those at 672–3 and 675–6, and demands the same connector. (δ' in the text of Lobeck¹ is probably a printer's error, since the lemma in his commentary has τ', and his second edition has τ' in both places.)

675–6 ἐν δ' ὁ παγκρατῆς Ὑπνος | λύει πεδήσας, οὐδ' αἰεὶ λαβὼν ἔχει. 'Like the rest, all-powerful Sleep releases what he binds, and does not hold forever what he seizes.' For the power of Sleep *Ant.* 606 τὰν οὐθ' ὕπνος αἰρεῖ ποθ' ὁ ἴπαντογήρως† (the last word has displaced some other description of Sleep's power: see Griffith), Hom. *Il.* 24.4–5 = *Od.* 9.372–3 ὕπνος | . . . πανδαμάτωρ, *Od.* 23.17 (ὕπνος) ὅς μ' ἐπέδησε φίλα βλέφαρ' ἀμφικαλύψας, Headlam on Herodas 3.54. Dawe on *OR* 27 discusses the construction of ἐν δ' ('and among them'; cf. West on Hes. *Op.* 283), overtranslated above after Jebb; ἐκ (coni. Bothe¹) would give ἐκλύει by tmesis (*El.* 713n.) via a polar error (235–6n.), but probably with too many words intervening. For λύει of sleep cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 46–8. For erroneous λαχών for λαβών (*Suda* α 655 = 1 64.17 Adler) cf. 825, *El.* 592, Eur. *Ion* 1295, Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 25.6.

677 ἡμεῖς δὲ πῶς οὐ γνωσόμεσθα σωφρονεῖν; 'And how shall we not learn to be prudent?' This σωφροσύνη 'consists in his awareness of his position in the order of things and his decision to occupy it' (Sicherl (1977) 82): the world no longer has room for him and the Atridae, and so he must leave it. The climax is marked by a change of syntax, namely the introduction of a rhetorical question (Race (1982) 14–15 with n. 43). ἡμεῖς denotes Ajax. Wilamowitz (1924b) 249–50 = (1935–72) IV 344 (*prob.* Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1377) claims that the reference is to 'weak people' in general, and that Ajax only applies the teaching to himself in the following line. But this complicates the *a fortiori* argument, ruins the balance between the first person plurals of 667–8 and 677 (which

should all refer to Ajax), and makes Ajax put himself on the level of other, fallible human beings, which even in this speech he does not do.

678 ἐγώγ· ‘I will learn.’ The single-word affirmative brings the lavish illustration of 669–77 to a forceful close. The text is owed to B. Heath (1762) 7–8 in place of transmitted ἐγὼ δ’ (for the error cf. 104); Seager (1813) 246 first suggests this punctuation explicitly. The transmitted text puts δέ in second position, γάρ in fourth; since the latter is not obviously corrupt, we need a sense break before ἐπίσταμαι. For ἐγώ, ἐγώγε used as responses to questions see 104n. The γε is emphatic: ‘I *will* learn’. Some take it to be limitative (cf. Jebb’s ‘I, at least, will learn’), misinterpreting ἡμεῖς in 677 (n.).

Porson (pre-1808b) 220 prefers ἐγῶδ’, a colloquial expression (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1668, A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 850–1) attested for S. in e.g. fr. 566.3 *TrGF* (such crisis is more normally typical of comedy: cf. Willi (2003) 238–9); but ‘I know it’ is not the required sense. Others keep the transmitted text, claiming that the thought is interrupted with ἐπίσταμαι (e.g. Anonymous B (1811) 115). Such an interruption would be baffling – the brief ἐγὼ δ’ gives no suggestion as to what Ajax would have said.

678–82 ἐπίσταμαι γὰρ ἄρτίως ὅτι | ὁ τ’ ἐχθρὸς ἡμῖν ἐς τοσόνδ’ ἐχθαρτέος, | ὥς καὶ φιλήσων αὖθις, ἔς τε τὸν φίλον | τοσαυθ’ ὑπουργῶν ὠφελεῖν βουλήσομαι, | ὥς αἰὲν οὐ μενοῦντα. ‘For just now I have learned that my enemy should be hated as one who will later behave as a friend; while as for a friend, I shall want to give him help and assistance this far, as someone who will not always remain so.’ Ajax states the maxim attributed to Bias of Priene (one of the Seven Sages, a byword for justice as early as Hipponax fr. 123 *IEG*, and, according to Hdt. 1.170, politically active in the mid-sixth century): ἔλεγε... φιλεῖν ὥς μισήσοντας· τοὺς γὰρ πλείστους εἶναι κακοὺς (Diog. Laert. 1.87), and cf. how the old κατὰ τὴν Βίαντος ὑποθήκην καὶ φιλοῦσιν ὥς μισήσοντας καὶ μισοῦσιν ὥς φιλήσοντας (Arist. *Rhet.* 1389b23–5). For variants on the saying see Jebb’s appendix, pp. 231–2, and Tziatzi-Papagianni (1994) 404–5. For ἄρτι of recent understanding cf. fr. 314.352 *TrGF*, Eur. *Alc.* 940, *Ba.* 1296 ἄρτι μανθάνω, Com. Adesp. fr. 1017.16 *PCG*.

ἡμῖν becomes ἡμην in most manuscripts; the latter ‘as [a] Hellenistic κοινή form often intrudes into poetic texts under cover of similar-looking words’ (Davies on *Tr.* 24, referring to Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 931; add Rutherford’s Phrynichus, pp. 240–2). MLW tentatively suggests that it reflects enclitic accentuation ἡμιν.

For the repetition ἐχθρὸς... ἐχθαρτέος involving the verbal adjective cf. *Tr.* 64, Archil. fr. 128.6 *IEG*, Theogn. 689. ἐχθαρτέος has a well-attested variant ἐχθραντέος; cf. *Ant.* 93 (ἐχθαρη, ἐχθρανῆ) and *El.* 177 (ἐχθαίρεις, ἐχθραίρεις). But elsewhere in tragedy only the former stem is found (thus Porson on

Eur. *Med.* 555). ἐχθραίν–seems to be a later form, perhaps influenced by the adjective ἐχθρός (morphologically ἐχθ–ρ–ος, but capable of reanalysis as ἐχθρ–ος); first attested at Xen. *Ag.* 11.5 ἤχθραίνε, it is very common in Imperial and Byzantine Greek.

τοσαῦθ' (which picks up 679 τοσόνδ') has a minority variant τοιαῦθ' (for the error cf. 780), but quantity, not quality, is at issue. 'The tense of βουλήσονται is modified by the futurity of the content of the wish' (Page on Eur. *Med.* 259): cf. 825, *OR* 1077, *OC* 1289, K–G 1 172–3, Bruhn §106, Radt (1985) 109–10 = (2002) 310, M. Lloyd (1999) 34, Collard (2005a) 378. In ὡς αἰὲν οὐ μενούντα the delayed negative comes after the word which it negates: cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 940 δαρὸν γὰρ οὐκ ἄρξει θεοῖς.

682–3 τοῖς πολλοῖσι γὰρ | βροτῶν ἀπιστός ἐσθ' ἑταιρείας λιμήν. 'For most men the harbour of comradeship is faithless.' For the image, illustrating a false sense of security, cf. Theogn. 113–14 μήποτε τὸν κακὸν ἄνδρα φίλον ποιῆσθαι ἐταῖρον, | ἀλλ' αἰεὶ φεύγειν ὥστε κακὸν λιμένα, Emped. D–K 31 B 112.3 (1 354.16) ξείνων αἰδοῖτο λιμένες (of true friends), Virg. *Aen.* 2.23 *statio male fida carinis*, Van Nes (1963) 167.

ἑταιρ(ε)ία appears elsewhere in tragedy only at Eur. *Or.* 1072, 1079. Willink on 1072 prefers –ει– because it is better attested in our passage, and read in the *Orestes* passages in a papyrus (2nd–3rd c. AD); –ι– is found in a papyrus of Eupolis, however (fr. 99.28 *PCG*; 4th/5th c.). MacDowell on Dem. 21.139 also prefers –ει–, comparing Ionic ἑταιρηίη (cf. Hdt. 5.71.1) and *IC* IV 72 col. x.38 ἑταιρείᾱ (Gortyn, c. 450); cf. also *IC* I ix/1.124, 135 (Dreros, 3rd/2nd c. BC), *IG* XII/3 450.3 (Thera, no date given). –εῖ– is metrically guaranteed at *Hom. Hym.* 4.58, Adaeus *A.P.* 7.51.4 = 14 *GP*, [Simon.] *A.P.* 7.509.2 = 1021 *FGE* (date unknown). The word confuses manuscripts elsewhere, as at Pl. *Resp.* 494e, Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.21, Dem. 21.139, Arist. *Pol.* 1313a41, where both forms are attested. Both may have been in use, as with ἀνδρ(ε)ία, which out of a dozen or so instances in drama has metrically guaranteed –ία at Eur. *Her.* 475 (εὐάνδρ(ε)ία) and –εῖα at Ar. *Nub.* 511. On balance the evidence supports the majority reading.

684 ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ μὲν τούτοισιν εὖ σχήσει. 'But concerning these things it will turn out well.' The brisk transition formula signals the move from reflection to instruction.

684–6 σὺ δὲ | ἔσω θεοῖς ἐλθοῦσα διὰ τέλους, γύναι, | εὖχου τελεῖσθαι τοῦμὸν ὦν ἔρᾳ κέαρ. 'Lady, you go inside and pray to the gods that they accomplish in all fullness what my heart is longing for.' The woman is curtly ordered to go inside as the man goes about his business: cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 554 (Orestes to Electra) τήνδε μὲν στείχιν ἔσω. For the prayer cf. Sappho fr. 1.26–7 Voigt ὅσσα δέ μοι τέλεσσαι | θῦμος ἰμέρρει, τέλεσον (with possibly idiomatic repetition of

τελ-, as at cf. *Ag.* 973 Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμάς εὐχὰς τέλει), Pind. *M.* 10.29–30 Ζεῦ πάτερ, τῶν μὲν ἔραται φρενί, σιγᾷ οἱ στόμα· πᾶν δὲ τέλος | ἐν τίν ἔργων.

For the choice between ἔσω and εἴσω see 235–6n. The weak variant διὰ τάχους (*prob.* Lloyd-Jones (1978) 218) may have resulted from ‘mental collation of the same phrase at 822’ (Dawe, *STS* I 148); the same corruption is possible at Gallus *A.P.* 5.49.1 = 223 *FGE* [τάχος cod.: τέλος Jacobs, *prob.* Page]. For τοῦμὸν ὦν ἐρᾷ κέαρ see (in addition to the passages cited above) Headlam on Herodas 7.61 ὦν ἐρᾷ θυμός; for ἔρωσ of strong, non-sexual desire cf. [967], Pind. *P.* 11.50n.

Tecmessa and Eurysaces leave via the skene. At the end of the previous scene Tecmessa repeatedly refused to obey Ajax by shutting the door and remaining calm; but now ‘the apparent abandonment of the suicide plan has put Tecmessa in a more compliant frame of mind’ (H/OK (2007) 370). It is preferable for her to go immediately, thereby demonstrating her obedience, than to wait until the end of Ajax’s speech.

687–9 ὑμεῖς θ’, ἐταῖροι, ταῦτά τῃδὲ μοι τάδε | τιμᾶτε, Τεύκρω τ’, ἣν μόλη, σημήνατε | μέλειν μὲν ἡμῶν, εὐνοεῖν δ’ ὑμῖν ἄμα· ‘And you, my comrades, I ask to honour these my wishes just as she does, and tell Teucer, if he comes, to look after my interests, and to show goodwill to you.’ For the alliteration of tau and theta see 527–8n. Blaydes¹ changes θ’ to δ’, which now has some slight manuscript support; he makes the same change at 1182. But in each case ‘δέ would mark the change in the persons addressed; τε marks the continuity of the precepts’ (Jebb on 1182). Despite 682–3, ἐταῖροι is not pointed; the implied insult would be gratuitous.

ὑμῖν became ὑμῶν in several manuscripts under the influence of preceding ἡμῶν; this led to the replacement of ἄμα by μετὰ (*K^{yp}*, *coni.* Schneidewin²) to give the genitive a valid construction. In such circumstances ὑπερ is another possible substitute for ἄμα, and a manuscript with both ὑπερ and μετὰ above the line, or in the margin, may be responsible for the further variant ὑπερμέγα, attested in classical literature only at *Ar. Eq.* 158 (with ὑμερμεγέθης in classical prose), but common in Byzantine Greek.

For personal μέλειν denoting a mixture of concern and loyalty cf. *El.* 341–2 (Electra to Chrysothemis) δεινὸν γὰρ σ’ οὔσαν πατρός οὐ σὺ παῖς ἔφυς | κείνου λελησθαι, τῆς δὲ τικτούσης μέλειν. Ajax then asks for Teucer to be well-disposed to the chorus, and therefore to look after them in his absence. West (1978a) 112–13 prefers ὑμῶν . . . ἡμῖν, which, if transmitted, no one would reject; but the order of the paradosis is also meaningful. Dawe writes εὖ νοεῖν [sic C] δ’ ὑμῶν ὑπερ (cf. (1968) 11, *STS* I 148–9), but without supplying a parallel for νοεῖν ὑπέρ τινος meaning ‘take thought on someone’s behalf’, his preferred sense (as West objects).

690 ἐγὼ γὰρ εἴμ' ἐκεῖσ' ὅποι πορευτέον 'For I will go that place where I must travel.' Ostensibly this is the place mentioned at 654–6, but for the journey to Hades cf. *Ant.* 891–3 ὦ τύμβος . . . | . . . οἱ πορεύομαι | πρὸς τοὺς ἑμαυτῆς, *Cat.* 3.11–12 *iter tenebricosum* | *illuc, unde negant redire quemquam*, 606–607/8n. ἐκεῖσε may also suggest the common use of ἐκεῖ for Hades ([855], 1372, *El.* 356n., Bruhn §247.6).

691–2 ὑμεῖς δ' ἄ φράζω δρᾶτε, καὶ τάχ' ἂν μ' ἴσως | πύθοισθε, κεί νῦν δυστυχῶ, σεσωμένον. 'But you do what I have told you, and you perhaps may learn that, even if I am now unfortunate, I have been saved.' For τάχα and ἴσως together denoting possibility see the examples cited by A/O on *Ar. Thesm.* 718–20 (also 1008–10n.); the combination seems so idiomatic that it would be hard for τάχα to mean 'soon' as well. For καὶ εἰ introducing an admitted fact see 562–4n. For the antithetical formulation at the end of a speech see 132–3n.

Iphigenia uses σώζομαι to speak of her death at Eur. *IA* 1440 σέσωμαι, κατ' ἐμὲ δ' εὐκλεῆς ἔσθι (*El.* 1170n.). σεσωμένον is owed to Wecklein for transmitted σεσωσμένον; for the orthography (guaranteed by analogy and grammarians' statements, and with a foothold in the manuscripts of other authors) see Rutherford's *Phrynichus*, p. 99, Threatte II 581 (and 652 on ἐσώθην), West's *Teubner Aeschylus*, p. xlv, Usener (1865) 241 = (1912–14) II 89, Wecklein (1869) 60–2. In 1857 L. Dindorf was the first to advocate removal of the offending sigma in all ancient literature (in his edition of Xenophon, p. x).

Ajax leaves via eisodos B, the first time that this passage has been used, and 'the first time that a character has exited at a different point from that of their entry' (H/OK (2007) 370).

SECOND STASIMON (693–718)

693–718 As a result of Ajax's apparent change of mind, this stasimon presents a complete contrast with the previous ode. Despair gives way to hope; sorrowful meditation on the past to the intense thrill of the present. Previously the chorus lamented the gulf between their homeland in Greece and their current misery in the Troad; now this separation dissolves as they mention Arcadia, Mysia, Cnossus, Delos, and the Icarian sea in a virtually pan-Aegean celebration. The gods were absent, except by metonymy, from the earlier stasimon; in this ode Pan, Apollo, Ares, and Zeus all participate in the atmosphere of joy. The lyric takes the form of a cletic hymn, which calls on the god to come to the worshipper, and which 'seems to apply particularly to gods who induce a certain emotional or mental condition' (West on *Hes. Op.* 2, with examples). The straightforward metre and relative brevity may have recalled Attic cult songs (Fraenkel (1931) II n. 28 = (1964) I 363 n. 4).

This happiness will be short-lived: joy turns to disaster, as often in choral odes (*El.* 472–3n.; cf. Donatus on Ter. *Ad.* 297 = π 69.23–4 Wessner *haec omnis περίστωσις tragica est: gaudiorum introductio ante funestissimum nuntium*). The very intensity of the chorus's happiness may have induced caution in the audience (cf. March (1991–3) 26, for whom an ode of joy in Sophocles is 'always an ominous sign'), especially if they were already suspicious of Ajax's sudden change of mind (646–92n.). But two later Sophoclean choruses express comparably happy sentiments without being disappointed (*El.* 472–501, *OC* 1044–95; see my *Electra*, p. 239 n. 31); the generic expectation of disaster may not have been overwhelming, therefore, and uncertainty remains.

STROPHIC PAIR (693–705 ~ 706–18)

(1) 693	706	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>zia</i>
(2) 694	707	υ—υ—υ—	<i>ia_λ ia_λ</i>
(3) 695	708	—υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>gl</i>
(4) 696	709	—υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>gl</i>
(5) 697	710	υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>gl</i>
(6) 698	711	υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>ia_λ dodr</i>
(7) 699	712	υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>ia_λ dodr</i>
(8) 699/700	712/13	—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>gl ia_λ</i>
(9) 701	714	—υ—υ—υ—υ— ^H	<i>dodr ia_λ</i>
(10) 702	715	—υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>cho dim</i>
(11) 703	716	υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>ia ia_λ</i>
(12) 704	717	≍—υ—υ—υ—	<i>tel (dragged)</i>
(13) 705	718	≍—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>ia cho ia_λ</i>

An alternative colometry of (5–7) runs

υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>gl ia_λ</i>
—υ—υ—υ—υ—	<i>dodr ia_λ</i>
—υ—υ—υ—	<i>dodr</i>

But my preferred arrangement better fits the rhetorical division in both strophe and antistrophe, not least by avoiding the division φάνηθ', ὦ | θεῶν χοροποι' ἄναξ, with likely period end after the bacchiac splitting ὦ from its vocative. Itsumi (1984) 79 n. 31 opts for the alternative colometry on the ground that the colon υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— (6–7) is unfamiliar, but goes on to suggest that it may be analysable as *ia_λ dodr* (an idea which I have adopted), similar to the colon *ia_λ gl*, the Sophoclean instances of which he proceeds to list (p. 80). Elsewhere in this ode the phrase υ—υ— comes at the end of a colon rather than the beginning; perhaps its placing at the beginning in (6–7) prevents rhythmical monotony.

Diggle (1994) 505 (cf. (1990) 121 = (1994) 395–6) cites parallels for the colon in (9) from S. and Aeschylus. But an attempt by Ll-J/W to replicate this in (10) fails (702–5n.). Secure parallels for the choriambic dimeter with initial base

— in (10) (cited by Diggle (1994) 506 n. 56 and West (1982) 116) are all from late Euripides; the one earlier parallel (*Suppl.* 999 ~ 1022: cf. Itsumi (1982) 64 and (1984) 72 n. 18) involves conjecture in both strophe and antistrophe, but Itsumi, Diggle, and Kovacs accept it.

L. Parker (1997) 79 cites parallels for the colon at (13); it ‘picks up without repeating the equivalent phalaecean [in (8)]’ (Dale (1936) 184 = (1969) 4).

693 ἔφριξ' ἔρωτι, περιχαρὴς δ' ἀνεπτάμαν. ‘I shudder with emotion and take flight in great joy.’ Strong emotion can be described in terms of shuddering (cf. Aesch. fr. 387 *TrGF* ἔφριξ' ἔρωσ δὲ [ἔρωτι Brunck: ἔρῳ δὲ Dindorf] τοῦδε μυστικοῦ τέλους, Stat. *Theb.* 1.493–4 *laetusque per artus | horror iit*) or flight (cf. *Ant.* 1307/8 ἀνεπτὰν φόβῳ, *OR* 487/8 πέτομαι δ' ἐλπίσιν, Eur. *Hel.* 632–3 γέγηθα, κρατὶ δ' ὀρθίους ἔθειρας | ἀνεπτέρωσα, Ap. Rh. 3.724 ἀνεπτὰτο χάρματι θυμός, Pearson on fr. 941.11, Padel (1992) 97 with n. 62, Schnyder (1995) 139 n. 32). The association of ἔρωσ (personified or not) with flight connects the two parts of the statement (cf. Anacr. fr. 378, 379(b) *PMG*, Ar. *Av.* 703–4, D. Steiner (2001) 244; Eros appears as a winged figure in art from the sixth century BC, for which see Hermayr *et al.* (1986) 851, Arnott's commentary on Alexis, p. 109). The sense ‘emotion’ is presumably a development from the regular sense ‘desire’.

The variant ἔφριξ' ἐν will have arisen from accidental intrusion of a preposition. For ἀνεπτάμαν rather than –όμην see 282n.

694–5 ἰὼ ἰὼ Πὰν Πάν, | ὦ Πὰν Πάν: for ἰὼ and gemination of the vocative in a cultic context cf. respectively *Ant.* 1146/7, *Phil.* 400, Dorsch (1983) 231 n. 188 and *IG* IV/1 130.24 ὦ ἦ Πὰν Πάν, Lyr. Adesp. fr. 933 *PMG*, Norden on Virg. *Aen.* 6.46, Fehling (1969) 173, Dorsch (1983) 203–4 n. 5, Wills (1996) 50–2; Cat. 61 has both throughout.

695–8 ἀλίπλαγκτε Κυλλανίας χιονοκτύπου | πετραίας ἀπὸ δειράδος | φάνηθ' ‘Come over the sea and appear from the rocky ridge of snow-beaten Cyllene.’ For the cletic command ‘appear’ cf. *Ant.* 1149/50, *OR* 163, Eur. *Alc.* 92, *Hipp.* 528, *Her.* 494, *Ba.* 1017, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 370, Ar. *Ach.* 567, *Eq.* 591, *Nub.* 266, *Thesm.* 1143–4, Kranz (1933) 186–7; also Glaucus *A.P.* 9.341.5 = 1823 *HE* Πὰν Πάν . . . ἔρχευ, West (2007) 318–20, and some passages cited in the next paragraph. Pan is asked to leave his usual haunts, as often in a cletic prayer (see Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.30.2).

Predicative ἀλίπλαγκτε goes with φάνηθ' (thus Hermann, Wackernagel (1926–8) 1 308 = (2009) 386–7, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.2.37, Dorsch (1983) 224 n. 139, Moorhouse 30–1; cf. *Phil.* 828/9 εὐαῆς [Hermann: –ἐς codd.] ἡμῖν ἔλθοις, Anacr. fr. 357.6–7 *PMG* σὺ δ' εὐμενὴς | ἔλθ' ἡμῖν, Lyr. Adesp. fr. 934.19 *PMG* Ἰλαος δ' ἐπινίσσο, and, for φαίνω accompanied by a predicative vocative, S. *Phil.* 759–60 ἰὼ δύστηνε σύ, | δύστηνε δῆτα διὰ πόντων πάντων φανείς), not with the preceding vocative; Pan's maritime connexions (for which

see Borgeaud (1979) 94 n. 150 $\approx$ (1988) 214 n. 154) are too thin to merit the title ‘sea-roaming’. The phrase as a whole balances Ἰκαρίων δ’ ὑπὲρ πελαγέων | μολών (702–3). For –πλαγκτος adjectives where the first element denotes the area wandered over cf. θαλασσοπλαγκτος ([Aesch.] *PV* 467, Eur. *Hec.* 782) and ὀρίπλαγκτος (Emped. P. Strasb. gr. inv. 1665–6.a(ii).26 Martin and Primavesi, *Ar. Thesm.* 325/6). For corruption to –ακτε see 596/7–598n.

Pan is associated with Mount Cyllene in Arcadia, birthplace of his father Hermes, at e.g. *Hom. Hym.* 19.30–47, Erucius *A.P.* 6.96.3 = 2202 *GP* Πανὶ φιλωρεῖται Κυλληνίῳ. More generally, he has connexions with Arcadia (see Borgeaud (1979) 15–69 = (1988) 3–44, Dorsch (1983) 223–4 n. 137) and mountains in general (cf. *OR* 1100/1, Meleager *A.P.* 7.535.1–2 = 4700–1 *HE*, Myrinus *A.P.* 6.108.1–2 = 2556–7 *GP* ὑψηλὸν ὄρεων ἔφοροι . . . | Πᾶνες, Borgeaud (1979) 91 n. 121 $\approx$ (1988) 213 n. 125).

For snow as ‘a poetic commonplace for . . . tall mountains’ see Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 206. χιονόκτυπος is ‘semantically an audacious compound, for κτύπος and its cognates invariably [I would prefer ‘usually’] signify noise, usually noise resulting from impact and usually loud noise’ (FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 155 ἡλιοκτύπος, citing e.g. Castorion fr. 310.1 *SH* νιφόκτυπος; Verdenius (1985) 305 adds ὀμβρόκτυπος and ὄμβρου κτύπος at Aesch. *Ag.* 656 and 1533, ‘where the context . . . shows that the idea of beating is more prominent than that of noise’, and ἄλικτυπος, as at *Ant.* 953, could be another example). The variants –οτύπου and –οτύπτου reflect confusion over the consonant cluster (as in ἄλιπλαγκτε).

698 ὦ θεῶν χοροποι΄ ἄναξ ‘O lord who, among the gods, is the dance-maker’; for the partitive genitive cf. *OC* 868–9 θεῶν | ὁ πάντα λεύσσων Ἥλιος. Translations such as ‘lord who directs the dances of the gods’ are wrong, since most gods are not normally portrayed as dancing. (There are exceptions. The young Zeus dances at *Titanomachy* fr. 8 *GEF*, where see Davies (1989a) 16; in *Hom. Hym.* 3.195–6, various female divinities dance to the music of Apollo, who is καλὰ καὶ ὕψι βιβάζ (3.202, 516); Pindar (fr. 148 S–M) describes Apollo as ὀρχήστ’ ἀγλαΐας ἀνάσσων, εὐρυφάρετ’ Ἀπολλων, and cf. fr. 94c).

Pan’s fifth-century iconography includes dancing (Boardman (1997) §5, 7, 22, 24, 129, 191, 232, 262); cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 448–9 φιλόχορος | Πάν, Pind. fr. 99 S–M (from a paraphrase) χορευτὴν τελεώτατον θεῶν, Carm. Conv. fr. 887.1–2 *PMG* ὦ Πάν . . . | ὀρχηστὰ, Cratinus fr. 359 *PCG*, Alcaeus *A.P.* 226.5–6 = 132–3 *HE*, Myrinus *A.P.* 6.108.1–2 = 2556–7 *GP* χοροπαῖκται | Πᾶνες, [Plato] 630–5 *FGE* (Pan pipes to dancing nymphs), Lyr. Adesp. fr. 936.3–4 *PMG* χρυσέων χόρων ἄγα[λ]μα | κωτίλας [ᾗ] γὰρ τ[α μ]οῖσα<ς> with Wagman, Borgeaud (1979) 220–1 $\approx$ (1988) 150–1, Dorsch (1983) 224–5 n. 140. Hdt. 5.67 describes how in the early sixth century Sicyonian τραγικοί χοροί (‘goat choruses’) in honour of Adrastus were reassigned to Dionysus by Cleisthenes,

while depictions of dancing goats from the seventh century have been found at Arcadia (Boardman (1997) §1; identification disputed) and Sparta (*ibid.* §2). In each case explicit identification with Pan is lacking, however.

Only Triclinius has χοροποιί. Most manuscripts have χοροποιέ, either by *scriptio plena*, or because scribes were influenced by the hiatus which often precedes ἀνάξ in epic. Corruption to χοροποιέ (cf. Eur. *Hec.* 917, *Phoen.* 788) was encouraged by περιχαρής in 693 and Pan's associations with merriment.

699–669/700 ὅπως μοι Μύσια Κνώσι' ὀρχήματ' αὐτοδαῆ ξυνὼν ἰάψης. 'so that you can be with me and tread the Mysian and Cnosian measures that you have taught yourself' (Lloyd-Jones). Μύσια is only in Π³ and the *Suda* (v 619 = III 489.27–490.6 Adler, s.v. Νύσια). In the latter Mysia appears in the statement ἐν Μύσιᾳ γὰρ καὶ Κνωσσῶ ἐπιμελής ἡ ὀρχησις, elsewhere in the entry Μύσια is corrupted to Νύσια, but we can deduce from the content that its text must originally have read Μύσια (thus Pearson (1923) 24–5). Π³ elsewhere offers a reliable text, with one unique reading (at 756) which is probably right (Introduction pp. 59–60); the additional support of the *Suda* suggests that this reading does not result from a chance error in the papyrus. The mediaeval manuscripts of S. have Νύσ(σ)ια. Below I set out the arguments for each; I believe that the stronger case favours Μύσια.

(i) 'Mysian measures' evokes the ecstatic worship of the Mother of the Gods (occasionally referred to as Cybele), a goddess associated with Phrygia and especially Mount Ida (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1324, *Or.* 1453–4, fr. 586 *TrGF*). She is linked with Mysia (effectively synonymous with Phrygia) at Timoth. fr. 791.105–38 *PMG* = Hordern, where the Persians begin their lament ἰὼ Μύσιαι | δένδροέθειραι πτυχαί before invoking the aid of the Mother (lines 121–9).

Pan's association with the Mother (both are associated with mountains, music, and possession: Vassileva (2001) 52), and her companions the Corybantes, is strong in classical literature (cf. Pind. fr. 96 S–M (to Pan) ὦ μάκαρ, ὃν τε μεγάλας | θεοῦ κύνα παντοδαπὸν | καλέοισιν Ὀλύμπιοι, *P.* 3.77–9 ἀλλ' ἐπεύξασθαι μὲν ἐγὼν ἐθέλω | Ματρί, τὰν κοῦραι παρ' ἑμὸν πρόθυρον σὺν Πανὶ μέλπονται θαμὰ | σεμνὰν θεὸν ἐννύχιαi, Eur. *Hipp.* 141–4, Ar. *Av.* 745–6, *Ecl.* 1068–9, Borgeaud (1979) 215–18 = (1988) 147–9, Roller (1999) 176–7) and Attic cult (cf. *CCCA* II §182, 309, 339, votive reliefs with Pan and the Mother; *ibid.* §394, her images in the 'caves of Pan' at Marathon, Phyle, and perhaps Vari, R. Parker (1996) 167 n. 50, Roller (1996) 306–8). Outside Attica, there may be a link between Pan and a mother goddess at the Kabirion sanctuary to the west of Thebes (cf. Schachter (1981–94) II 90–3, 139). The link proved long-lasting: a stone of Hadrianic date in the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus (*IG* IV/1 129–31 = Lyr. Adesp fr. 935–7 *PMG*) was inscribed with hymns to the Mother, Pan, and all the gods.

From at least the late sixth century the Mother was also associated with the Cretan Rhea, whom Hipponax called Cybelis (cf. fr. 156, 127 *IEG*, Eur. *Ba.* 58–9, 126–9, N. Robertson (1996) 246–53, Roller (1999) 170–4). Both were the subjects of ecstatic worship, were associated with a Mount Ida (for Rhea’s cave on the Cretan Ida, perhaps about twenty miles west of Cnossus, see Robertson p. 248, Prent (2005) 375–6), and were worshipped by armed male dancers, respectively the Corybantes and the Curetes, who were themselves identified with each other (cf. Eur. *Ba.* 120–5, Strabo 10.3.7, Lucr. 2.629–39).

So when the chorus call for Pan to come to them and lead the dance in Mysian and Cnossian styles, they refer to his connexion with the Mother of the Gods, seen under her two aspects, one Phrygian, the other Cretan. This duality is appropriate for a Greek chorus located in the Troad.

(ii) ‘Nysian measures’ evokes the worship of Dionysus, who is associated with the mythical Mount Nysa (cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.133, S. *Ant.* 1130/1, Eur. *Cycl.* 68, *Ba.* 556), said to have been his birth-place at Hom. *Hym.* 1.2–14 (perhaps late seventh century: see West’s edition, p. 7) and S. fr. 959 *TrGF*. Its location was variable: the *Iliad* appears to put it in Thrace, the Homeric Hymn puts it τηλοῦ Φοινίκης, σχεδὸν Αἰγύπτῳ ῥοάων, while Hesychius v 742 (ii 720 Latte) suggests fifteen different places.

The connexion between Pan and Dionysus is weakly attested in the fifth century; it is found in Hom. *Hym.* 19.45–7, which might be this early (see West’s edition, p. 18). For subsequent literary associations cf. Pl. *Leg.* 815c, Lucian 29.9, Polyaeus *Strat.* 1.2, and Lehnus, in his edition of Pindar’s *Hymn to Pan*, pp. 189–90 n. 1. In art Pan ‘becomes a regular member of [Dionysus] thiasos from the 4th cent<ury> on’ (Boardman (1997) 933); none of the many depictions which Boardman cites (pp. 934–5) showing the two gods is dated before the mid-fourth century. Nor does Dionysus have strong Cretan connexions. Call. fr. 43.117 Pfeiffer = 50.117 Massimilla refers to the birth of Ζαγρεὺς (i.e. Dionysus: see West (1983) 152–4) in what appears to be a Cretan context. He is associated with the Mother in the fifth century, usually under her Phrygian aspect (cf. Kannicht’s edition of Euripides’ *Helen*, ii 331–2, Pachis (1996) 210 with n. 55); for his connexion with Rhea cf. Eur. *Ba.* 58–9. The one possible example elsewhere in Boardman’s article, §4 (Attic volute krater, c. 490), is not a certain depiction of Dionysus.

In a fifth-century context Dionysus fits much less well than the Mother. Later his link with Pan strengthens, and so corruption from original Μῦσια to Νύσια becomes plausible; the reverse is harder to motivate.

For ‘Cnossian measures’ cf. Tr. Adesp. fr. 225 *TrGF* Κνώσια κῶλα. Manuscripts offer Κνώσ- and Κνώσσ-. The only other tragic instance (Eur. *Her.* 1327) has Κνώσσ- (in a single manuscript), while the testimony of the *Iliad* is each time divided (2.646, 18.591); West (his edition, vol. 1 p. xxxii) advocates

a single sigma there on the evidence of inscriptions from Attica (cf. Threatte 1 524) and Crete (cf. Büchner (1922) 922).

For the prefix in αὐτοδαῖ see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 8 αὐτογενῆ ('self-generated'); also Alcaeus *A.P.* 6.218.10 = 143 *HE* θῆρα τὸν ὀρχησμών αὐτομαθῆ Κυβέλης. As the master of the dance Pan has no teacher; cf. the bard Phemius, who boasts of being αὐτοδίδακτος (*Od.* 22.347).

ιάπτω 'means to "shoot" . . . , but it is used in a metaphorical sense for "doing anything quickly". Hence ὀρχήματ' ἱάπτειν means to "shoot forth dances", just as Aeschylus (*Ag.* 1548[–9]) talks of "shooting out the hymn", ἐπιτύμβιον αἶνον . . . ἱάπτων with an even bolder metaphor' (Long (1968) 91–2). Most manuscripts have the regular subjunctive ἱάψης after ὅπως; but the future is in L, and is occasionally found elsewhere in this construction (cf. *Phil.* 1069, fr. 314.266, *TrGF*, and (after ὥς) *OC* 1724/5 (metrically guaranteed; Moorhouse 289). Corruption to the subjunctive would be almost expected (556–7n.). I keep the majority reading, but L may well be right.

701 νῦν γὰρ ἐμοὶ μέλει χορεύσαι. 'For now dancing is my concern.' Dance is a fundamental element of ancient worship and celebration; there is no extra-dramatic reference to the tragic chorus, any more than at *OR* 896 τί δέ με χορεύειν; MD notes the difference of aspect between the two passages: 'there the whole notion of sacred dances is called into question; here a single occasion is envisaged'. For the possibility that something has dropped out after this line see 714n.

702–5 Ἰκαρίων δ' ὑπὲρ πελαγέων μολῶν ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων | ὁ Δάλιος εὖγν-
ωστος | ἐμοὶ ξυνείη διὰ παντὸς εὖφρων. 'May Lord Apollo of Delos come over the Icarian waters to be with me, manifest in his presence and always well disposed.' The god is associated with Pan at *OR* 1098–1102/3, Eur. *IT* 1125–31, *Ion* 492–506, Ar. *Ran.* 229–34; in iconography any such connexions are 'mainly trivial', however (Boardman (1997) 933). Whereas Pan had been asked to lead the dance, the more dignified Apollo is requested to display a beneficent attitude.

'Delian' is a familiar and ancient title of Apollo (cf. A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 316, Dorsch (1983) 226 n. 149). For the picture of the god travelling above the sea cf. *Hom. Hym.* 2.380–3 οὐδὲ θάλασσα | οὐθ' ὕδωρ ποταμῶν οὐτ' ἄγκρα ποιήεντα | ἵππων ἀθανάτων οὐτ' ἄκριες ἐσχεθον ὁρμήν, | ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν βαθὺν ἥερα τέμνον ἰόντες. The Icarian sea (first mentioned at *Hom. Il.* 2.145) took its name from Icarus, son of Daedalus, who drowned in it while attempting to fly from Crete. This myth is attested in art from the mid sixth century BC (cf. Nyenhuis (1986) 320 with §31).

For similar prayers 'for the peaceful advent of a deity' see Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.19.16 and Davies on *Tr.* 660 (citing e.g. Anacr. fr. 357.6–7 *PMG*, to which add *Phil.* 828; both cited 695–8n.). For εὖφρων in a prayer

cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1282, *Thesm.* 1148 (both lyr.), Pind. *O.* 2.14, Ausfeld (1903) 537–8, Keyßner (1932) 88–9; also Ariphron fr. 813.2 *PMG* (to Ὑγίεια) σὺ δέ μοι πρόφρων ξυνείης. For ἔμοι ξυνείη cf. *OR* 273–5 ὕμν... | ... ἧ τε σύμμαχος Δίκη | χοῖ πάντες εὖ ξυνείεν εἰσαεῖ θεοί. The minority variant ξυνείης may be influenced by the earlier second person address to Pan.

At 702 ~ 715 the manuscripts offer — — — — — in the strophe (if we assume synizesis of —έων), — — — — — in the antistrophe. By assuming a corrupt strophe (obelising πελαγέων), Ll-J/W obtain a colon which appears to match that of 701 ~ 714 (9). But (i) there is no secure instance in this metrical context of the colon with a long in fifth position, since that generates a sequence which belongs to dactylo-epitrite, not aeolo-choriambic (thus Diggle (1994) 506); (ii) the bacchiac at the end of a colon should mark period-end since it is followed by a short syllable (199–199/200n.), yet elision in 715 makes period-end impossible. Apart from the misplaced desire to generate this faulty verse, there is no other reason to suspect πελαγέων, which Ll-J/W suggest crept in as a gloss (28n.; cf. *Ant.* 966/7, where πελαγέων πετρών is corrupt and may, in whole or in part, have entered the text in the same way, as Pearson (1919) 125 suggests). For the displaced original reading they conjecture κελεύθων (comparing Eur. *IT* 890 μακρὰ κέλευθα, in a marine context, and ὕγρὰ κέλευθα at Hom. *Il.* 1.312 etc., to which add *Od.* 3.177 ἰχθυόεντα κέλευθα; an alternative would be κλυδώνων). Renehan (1992) 348–9 attempts to furnish an additional reason by arguing that πελάγη is only used as plural for singular when accompanied by a genitive singular (e.g. Hom. *Od.* 5.335 ἄλως ἐν πελάγεσσι); Eur. *Or.* 991–2 Πέλοψ... ἐπὶ πελάγεσσι διεδίφρευσε provides a tragic counterexample.

Keeping the strophe untouched requires us to emend the antistrophe, replacing φατίξαιμ' with φατίσαιμ' (Livineius 'p'). The Doric xi (for which see S–D 1 737–8) is attested for tragedy only in Aeschylus (*Suppl.* 38, *Ag.* 785 (anap.), *Cho.* 955 (lyr.; a very likely conjecture), and fr. 281b.4 *TrGF* (trim.)). (The weakly-attested variant φατίζαιμ' will have been prompted by confusion over the Doric form, as in some manuscripts at Aesch. *Ag.* 785; corruption from ζ to ξ is sometimes found, as at *Ag.* 443 and 681, but if ζ is correct here we would need a further change to φατίζοιμ'.) This change of a single letter gives metre which is just acceptable (see (10) in the metrical analysis above). We would like to keep the xi, since it is odd for such a rare form to be the result of corruption; but metre tells against it, as detailed above.

706 ἔλυσεν αἰνὸν ἄχος ἀπ' ὀμμάτων Ἄρης. 'Ares has taken dreadful pain away from my eyes.' For Ares as deliverer cf. *Tr.* 653–4 νῦν δ' Ἄρης οἰστρηθεῖς | ἐξέλυσ' ἐπιπτόνων ἀμερᾶν. There Ares' deliverance of Deianira by provoking Heracles to attack Oechalia is an unintended side-effect; here the chorus of soldiers attribute their release to the direct intervention of the war-god. For

cults of Ares in Athens see 179–181/2n. For λύω predicated of divinity cf. *Ti.* 653–4, Aesch. *Suppl.* 1065, *Cho.* 805, Sappho fr. 1.25–6 Voigt.

αἶνὸν ἄχος (cf. *Il.* 4.169, *Hom. Hym.* 5.198–9, Kelly (2007) 160) regularly affects the κραδίη, θυμός, or φρένες; S. reworks the epic expression by applying it to the ὄμματα. Grief can be portrayed as a cloud (*Hom. Il.* 17.591) which covers the eyes or face (*Ant.* 528–30, Aesch. *Sept.* 227–9, Eur. *Hipp.* 172, *El.* 1078, *Hor. Ep.* 1.18.94): hence the departure of ἄχος from the eyes.

ἔλυσεν (*coni.* B. Heath (1762) 8) is corrected in LK to ἔλυσεν γάρ, which is weakly attested elsewhere; most manuscripts have ἔλυσε γάρ. Absence of respension condemns γάρ, which will have been inserted to avoid asyndeton (cf. 634/5n.). Turyn (1952) 109 n. 114 and 167 n. 179 prefers λῦσεν γάρ; but the diagnosis of an intrusive augment (for which see Pind. *P.* 11.37n.) should not be preferred to a corruption with a definite motive and which actually appears in two of our three oldest witnesses. Elmsley (*teste* Blaydes¹) suggests ἔλυσε δ', where δ' could have become –ν or γάρ in different manuscripts by respectively a transcription error or the intrusion of a gloss (28n.). But why assume two (unattested) errors when one (attested) will do (cf. 45n.)?

707–10 ἰὼ ἰὼ, νῦν αὔ, | νῦν, ὦ Ζεῦ, πάρα λευκὸν εὐάμερον πέλᾶσαι φάος |
 θεῶν ὠκυάλων νεῶν 'Io, io, now once again, now, o Zeus, can the bright light
 of happy days shine on the swift ships that speed across the sea.' For anadiplosis
 (of νῦν) as a characteristic of religious language see Davies on *Ti.* 655. The
 ships stand for the Greek encampment as a whole, which Ajax has rescued by
 returning to his previous state of mind. For deliverance associated with light
 cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 300–1 (the Queen, on hearing that Xerxes is safe) ἑμοῖς μὲν
 εἶπας δώμασιν φάος μέγα | καὶ λευκὸν ἡμαρ νυκτὸς ἐκ μελαγχίμου, *Cho.* 961
 πάρα τὸ φῶς ἰδεῖν, S. *El.* 1224n.; also Pearson on fr. 6 (λευκὴ ἡμέρα meaning
 a good or successful day). For metaphorical εὐαμερ– cf. Eur. fr. 759a.1582–3
TiGF χρόνῳ δ' ἐξέλαμψεν εὐάμερος, Diggle on *Pha.* 91. For πελάζω with the
 genitive see Bruhn §35, LSJ⁹ s.v. A 1 2; also 887/8–890n.

θεός and ὠκύαλος are epithets for ships in Homer (the former *passim*, the
 latter only at *Od.* 12.182, 15.473). The latter probably derives from ἄλλομαι
 rather than ἄλς (cf. Risch (1974) 207), but S. will not have known the etymology,
 and is perhaps more likely to have derived it from ἄλς, given the single lambda.
 For the tautology cf. *Phil.* 516 εὐστόλου ταχείας νεώς, *Hom. Od.* 7.34 νηυσὶ
 θεῇσιν . . . πεπιθότες ὠκείησι, Gow on Theocr. 7.15.

711–712/13 δτ' Αἴας λαθίπονος πάλιν, | θεῶν δ' αὖ πάνθ' ὅσα θέσμι' ἐξήνυσ'
 εὐνομίᾳ σέβων μεγίστα. 'now that Ajax has gone back to forgetting his troubles
 and fulfilled the rites of the gods with all their sacrifices, doing them reverence
 in the greatest good order.' Ajax's new piety is an instance of εὐνομία, on
 which see West on Hes. *Th.* 902; for νόμοι used of specifically religious matters
 see Ostwald (1969) 40–3. Perhaps because it was often a loaded political term,

the stem is rarely attested in tragedy (elsewhere only at Aesch. fr. 198.1, fr. dub. 489.3–4 *TrGF*).

λαθίπονος, presumably coined on λαθικηδής (Hom. *Il.* 22.83, Alcaeus fr. 346.3 Voigt), is attested elsewhere only at *Tr.* 1021 (lyr.). The unusual long alpha in both Sophoclean instances may have been introduced on the analogy of λη– in e.g. λήσσομαι; cf. λᾶθάνεμος at Simon. fr. 17.2 Poltera. πάλιν denotes that Ajax is back where he was before the trouble started. Metrically guaranteed ἐξήγνυσ’ for transmitted ἐξήγνυσεν is owed to Livineius ‘pV’ (31–3n.).

714 πᾶνθ’ ὁ μέγας χρόνος μαραίνειν ‘Great Time causes all things to decay.’ Cf. Simon. eleg. fr. 88 *IEG* (cited 646–7n.), Hor. *C.* 3.6.45 *damnosa quid non imminuit dies?* with Nisbet and Rudd, 854.2 *EG* ὁ μυριέτης δ’ οὐ μαρανεῖ σε χρόνος. The chorus’s remark looks back to 646–7, where also ‘all things’ are the target of time’s activity, but their understanding of the process described by Ajax is deficient: ‘rather than the alternation, the continual change of the hidden and the evident, the chorus see the effect of time as a single action of extinguishing’ (Goldhill (1986) 191).

Manuscripts and the *Suda* follow this sentence with τε καὶ φλέγει, which Stobaeus (1.8.24 = 1 97.19 W–H) omits. Livineius first deletes the phrase, referring to metrical considerations, though without saying whether Stobaeus had prompted him. This could be a unique preservation of the truth in Stobaeus (Introduction §8(a)iii), but as he quotes πᾶνθ’ . . . μαραίνει in isolation we cannot be sure (MLW). The phrase does not correspond to anything in the strophe (701); either something has dropped out there, or there is an interpolation here. Against the former, there is no obvious gap in 701, no convincing supplement has been proposed, and the resulting colon is ‘metrically anomalous, [*ia_λ ia*] scarcely if at all occurring in lyric iambics before late Euripides’ (Willink (2002) 60 = (2010) 395). *El.* 855 provides another apparently motiveless expansion of a lyric phrase.

715–18 κούδὲν ἀναύδητον φατίσαιμ’ ἄν, εὐτέ γ’ ἐξ ἁέλπτων | Αἴας μεταγενώσθη | θυμοῦ τ’ Ἀτρείδαις μεγάλων τε νεικέων. ‘And I would declare that there is nothing you can say is impossible, now that Ajax has unexpectedly been led to repent of his anger against the Atridae and his mighty quarrel.’ For the idea ‘Nothing is impossible, because . . .’ see 648–9n.

ἀναύδητον means “‘not to be spoken of,’” in the sense, “‘not to be affirmed as possible’” (Jebb). The vocalism is uncertain, since the two other tragic occurrences are split between alpha (Aesch. *Sept.* 897 (lyr.)) and eta (Eur. *Ion* 782, based on a single manuscript (lyr.)). (At *Tr.* 968 (lyr.) ἀναύδατος is Erfurd’s conjecture for transmitted ἄναυδος.) My preference, eta, is what most adjectives of this form have in lyrics (cf. Björck (1950) 169–70). Valckenaer (1743–6) 16 verso first suggests ἀναύδατον, prompted by the nonsensical lemma in Hesychius ἀναύδακτον· ἀνεξήγητον, ἄλεκτον (so Alberti i 346, Schmidt α

4650 = 1185; Latte α 4650 = 1162 claims that the manuscript reads ἀναύδατον, which is presumably a slip), which, he argued, came from a text of our play in which an eta was written over the alpha. (J. V. Pergerus may have envisioned the same process, as he writes (*ap.* J. Wolf (1722–4) IV 207; see p. 172 for the attribution to P.) ‘ἀναύδακτον] scribe ἀναυδάητον i.e. ἀναύδατον. Sophocl. Ajace: κούδεν ἀνάνδητον [sic] φατίσαιμ’ ἄν’.) This is clever, and may be right.

For φατίσαιμ’ see 702–5n. For ἔξ used ‘of the base of an action, its underlying condition or manner of performance (often equivalent to an adverb of manner)’ (Moorhouse 110) see *El.* 48n., adding Aesch. *Suppl.* 357 ἔξ ἀέλπτων κἀπρομηθήτων with FJ/W, Diggle (1994) 490, Eur. fr. 100.2, 550.1 *TrGF*, Ion 19 f 50 *TrGF* ἐκ τῶν ἀέλπτων, S. *Tr.* 485 ἔξ ἴσου ‘equally’.

The passive μετανεγνώσθη (cf. Σ p. 167 Chr. μετεπείσθη, μετεβλήθη) matches the voice used by Ajax in his description of the process (651). For the unusual passive Knox (1966) 216–17 = (1979) 234 compares *Ant.* 1105–6 καρδίας δ’ ἐξίσταμαι | τὸ δρᾶν: ‘the expressions used convey by their awkward distortion of plain speech the strain which a change of mind imposes on the tragic character’. The sigma in the ending is confirmed (against Wecklein (1881) 140, who would remove it, citing Hesych. μ 1031 = 11 655 Latte μετανεγνώθη) by two forms of the simplex verb in an Athenian inscription of the mid-fifth century (*IG* 1³ 14.30–1; cf. West’s Teubner Aeschylus p. xliii). The minority variant μετεγνώσθη arose from simplification of the double prefix.

θυμοῦ is owed to Hermann (1796) 441. Of the manuscript readings, θυμόν is impossible because we need a genitive with μετανεγνώσθη (cf. 744, Eur. *Med.* 896–7 διαλλάχθηθ’ ἄμα | τῆς πρόσθεν ἑχθρας ἐς φίλους), while θυμῶν (*prob.* Schadewaldt (1956) 494 = (1970) 1480) shows a plural otherwise unattested in tragedy (a telling objection, given the frequency of the noun). Supporters of θυμῶν point to the sense ‘fits of passion’ at e.g. Pl. *Phileb.* 40e (cf. Nisbet and Rudd on Hor. *C.* 3.14.25 on Latin *animi* = ‘fiery spirit’), but even if allowed for tragedy, this meaning is weak here: it suggests discrete bursts of passion rather than the unceasing anger which Ajax has felt since the Judgment of the Arms, and which he is now supposedly relinquishing. For corruption from –οῦ to –όν see 134–5n.; the –ων endings later in the line would have encouraged further corruption to –όν. Only A has τ’ following this word, an adjacent corruption indicating that the text here underwent particular stress.

THIRD EPISODE, PART ONE (719–814)

719–47 After the deception speech, and the chorus’s misplaced joy, the audience might once again anticipate Ajax’s death. But the new arrival comes from the camp, and so cannot be bearing such a report: Ajax left in the opposite direction (thus H/OK (2007) 370). He begins with good news (719–21), but

soon reveals sadder tidings, contrasting with the mood of the song. Once again, the στρατήγιον is nearly a murder site; Ajax had nearly killed the two leaders of the army here on his night attack (49), and now his half-brother is almost lynched by the army in the same place, in daylight, after returning from a raid (721–2), as a consequence of Ajax’s action. The prospect of external annihilation, unmentioned since 405a–408/9, re-emerges.

The Messenger’s speech is followed by the first stichomythia since 594, providing welcome variety after successive chunks of text. This has barely begun before the apparently innocuous information that Ajax has left the hut provokes the Messenger to a loud exclamation (737). Piecemeal revelation continues. The chorus, and audience, learn first of the ban on Ajax’s departure, and then, crucially, its author; the name of Calchas worries even the somewhat complacent chorus (contrast 747 with 743–4). The sophisticated method of exposition is both psychologically plausible (the Messenger has no reason to think that Ajax has already gone, and so he begins with the news about Teucer) and dramatically effective (information is conveyed in two speeches, each expressing new and separate threats to Ajax’s party; the second longer and more involved, and separated by significant stichomythia).

The Messenger enters from eisodos A, probably in haste.

719–21 ἄνδρες φίλοι, τὸ πρῶτον ἀγγεῖλαι θέλω, | Τεῦκρος πάρεστιν ἄρτι Μυσιῶν ἀπὸ | κρημνῶν. ‘Friends, first I wish to make my announcement: Teucer has just arrived from the Mysian heights.’ The Messenger begins with good news: cf. Ar. *Eq.* 642–3 λόγους ἀγαθοὺς φέρων | εὐαγγελίσασθαι πρῶτον ὑμῖν βούλομαι, Symmachus *Ep.* 4.19.1 *a prosperis ordiendum est*; also OR 958–9 εἰ τοῦτο πρῶτον δεῖ μ’ ἀπαγγεῖλαι σαφῶς, | εὖ ἴσθ’ ἐκείνον θανάσιμον βεβηκότα, where the Messenger is reluctant to begin by mentioning Polybus’ death.

ἄνδρες φίλοι reassures chorus and audience that the Messenger is friendly. Musgrave’s φίλον, giving ‘Gentlemen, I wish to begin with a good announcement’, would fit with ‘the messenger’s insistence on opening his news with a word of good omen’ (Davies on *Ti.* 229; cf. OR 87–8, Eur. *El.* 230 ζῆ· πρῶτα γάρ σοι τὰγάθ’ ἀγγέλλειν θέλω, and, for φίλον in this context, *Suppl.* 634 γυναικες, ἦκω πόλλ’ ἔχων λέγειν φίλα), but removes a useful vocative. τὸ πρῶτον is adverbial, while the absence of ὅτι following θέλω ‘marks the speaker’s eager haste’ (Jebb, comparing OR 1234–5 ὁ μὲν τάχιστος τῶν λόγων εἰπεῖν τε καὶ | μαθεῖν, τέθηκε θεῖον Ἰοκάστης κάρα). πρῶτον τὸδ’ (*coni.* Blaydes’) regularises the syntax at the cost of this stylistic point.

721–2 μέσον δὲ προσμολὼν στρατήγιον | κυδάζεται τοῖς πᾶσιν Ἀργείοις ὁμοῦ. ‘But as he came near to the central headquarters, he was reviled by

all the Greeks together.’ Ajax nearly kills the Greek leaders here on his night attack (719–47n.).

κυδάζω (short upsilon, and so unrelated to κύδος ‘glory’) is attested at Aesch. fr. 94 *TiGF*, Epicharm. fr. 6.1, 32.6 *PCG*, Ap. Rh. 1.1337; according to Gloss. Ital. fr. 28 *PCG* κύδος is Syracusan for λοιδορία (cf. Willi (2008) 133). The Homeric scholia (ΣΤ *Il.* 24.592b = v 617.12–13 Erbse, s.v. σκυδμαινέμεν) tell us that σκυδάζειν Σοφοκλῆς φησιν ἐν τῷ Αἴαντι; the unattested variant σκυδάζεται which this implies probably results from a memory slip encouraged by σκ– in the lemma.

723–4 στείχοντα γὰρ πρόσωθεν αὐτὸν ἐν κύκλῳ | μαθόντες ἀμφέστησαν ‘For as he approached, they noticed him from afar and stood round him in a circle’. This was no unplanned lynching: they were watching and waiting for him. πρόσωθεν goes with what follows; Stinton (1975b) 82 = (1990) 98–9 takes it with στείχοντα (‘as he came from afar’), which replaces this menacing effect with an irrelevant reference to the length of Teucer’s journey. Encirclement is an obvious tactic on the part of a larger group to maximise contact with an individual or object, whether for a hostile purpose (cf. Eur. *Andr.* 1137, *IT* 331–2, *Ba.* 1106–9, Hdt. 1.43.1) or not (cf. *Phil.* 356–7 καὶ μ’ εὐθύς ἐν κύκλῳ στρατὸς | ἐκβάντα πᾶς ἡσπάζετ’, *Ti.* 194–5 (*coni.*), Aesch. *Cho.* 983–4, fr. 379 *TiGF*).

724–5 εἴτ’ ὀνειδέσιν | ἥρασσον ἔνθεν κᾶνθεν, οὕτις ἔσθ’ ὅς οὐ ‘then they assailed him with insults, from this side and that – there was no one who held back’. ἀράσσω normally denotes actual blows, but for this sense cf. *Phil.* 374–5 κάγῳ χολωθεὶς εὐθύς ἥρασσον κακοῖς | τοῖς πᾶσιν, οὐδὲν ἐνδεὲς ποιούμενος, Ar. *Nub.* 1373–4 εὐθέως ἀράττω [v.l. εὐθύς ἑξαράττω] | πολλοῖς κακοῖς καίσχροῖσι; also Aesch. *Sept.* 382 θείνει δ’ ὀνειδεῖ μάντιν. For the double negative οὕτις ἔσθ’ ὅς οὐ cf. *OR* 372–3 ἃ σοὶ | οὐδεὶς ὅς οὐχὶ τῶνδ’ ὀνειδιεῖ τάχα, Wackernagel (1926–8) II 301 = (2009) 777–8, K–G II 414–15. Anacoluthon evokes confused violence. The variant κοῦτις is a rare example of crasis introduced by error (39n.; reverse mistake at 648), encouraged by crasis in the preceding word.

726–7 τὸν τοῦ μανέντος κάπιβουλευτοῦ στρατῷ | ξύναιμον ἀποκαλοῦντες ‘calling him the kinsman of the man who went mad and plotted against the army’. For Ajax’s relationship with the army see 44n. ‘An article with the predicate after “call”, “name”, etc. has the effect of reporting the speaker’s actual words’ (Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 589–90): cf. 1013–14, 1289, Bruhn §88, Svensson (1937) 23–4, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 713. The technique makes the crowd’s words more vivid and immediate. στρατῷ for transmitted στρατοῦ is owed to Schaefer (1808) 246. The *nomen agentis* ἐπιβουλεύτης takes a dative, as do ἐπιβουλεύω and related words (cf. 1055); presumably the preceding genitives caused the corruption.

727–8 ὥς τ' οὐκ ἄρκέσσι | τὸ μὴ οὐ πέτροισι πᾶς καταξάνθεις θανεῖν. 'and that he would not be able to prevent his being fatally lacerated with stones.' For stoning see 253/4–256n. τ' (*coni.* Musgrave) is in only a few manuscripts, while οὐ too is only partially attested; for the corruptions see respectively 98n. and 96n. Instead of ἄρκέσσι, a few manuscripts have –έσει. We may as well print the better attested form, which is also the more likely to be corrupted, the future optative being rare (thus JD). The reverse error happens at 1242. For the article with the infinitive cf. 1143, K–G II 43–5. πέτροισι is corrupted to πέτρῃσι in some manuscripts; for the error cf. *Phil.* 272, *Aesch. Pers.* 460, *Eur. Phoen.* 1143. πέτρος denotes a stone suitable for throwing, πέτρα a natural structure made out of rock, or a massive boulder (cf. *Hom. Od.* 9.243, *Hes. Th.* 675).

ῥαίνειν is to card or comb raw wool in order to make it fit for spinning, by separating the fibres and removing impurities' (Barrett on *Eur. Hipp.* 274; cf. [1029–31]n., D. Müller (1974) 199–200). Derived from this is καταξάνειν 'tear to shreds', often found in the context of stoning (*Aesch. fr.* 132c.2 *TrGF*, *Eur. Suppl.* 503, *Phoen.* 1145, *Ar. Ach.* 319–20 (with Olson)). The usage might be a tragic idiom as much as an image of everyday speech (cf. Collard (2005a) 379–80).

729–30 ὥστ' εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον ὥστε καὶ χεροῖν | κολεῶν ἐρυστὰ διεπεραιώθη ξίφη. 'As a result, things came to such a pitch that swords were even drawn and completed the transit of their scabbards.' As the scholia recognise (p. 171 Chr.), this recalls the episode in *Iliad* 1 where Achilles begins to draw his sword to attack Agamemnon, only to thrust it back in his scabbard after the intervention of Athena (194 εἴλκετο δ' ἐκ κολεοῖο μέγα ξίφος, 220 ἄψ δ' ἐς κουλεὸν ὥσε μέγα ξίφος). But she intervenes at an early stage (cf. imperfect εἴλκετο); here the swords are already out (aorist ἐρυστὰ διεπεραιώθη). That is, 'the strife had gone as far as it could without actual bloodshed' (Campbell, *PS*); cf. 731. Fehling (1974) 74 with n. 318 compares *Virg. Aen.* 1.148–53 for a near-stoning halted by a third party. See Fehling 63 n. 261 for stoning as a response to (attempted) regicide, and 69 n. 293 for the stoning of a criminal's associates.

Mastronarde on *Eur. Phoen.* 1328 cites examples of the idiom εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον ὥστε without a genitive accompanying τοσοῦτον. For ἐρύω of drawing a weapon cf. *Tr.* 1032/3 ἀνεπίφθονον εἴρυσον ἐγχοῦς, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐρύω (A) A 2. My translation of διεπεραιώθη (usually 'take across', e.g. a river) is owed to MLW.

731–2 λήγει δ' ἔρις δραμοῦσα τοῦ προσωτάτω | ἀνδρῶν γερόντων ἐν ξυναλλαγῇ λόγου. 'But the strife abated, after running to the furthest point, through the old men's reconciling words.' In the *Iliad* the aged Nestor similarly intervenes in the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon (729–30n.),

but to no avail; he has more success in preventing a nascent dispute between Agamemnon and Diomedes (9.52–78; H/OK (2007) 377–8 refer to other Iliadic mediations). Old age mollifies at Hor. *C.* 3.14.25–6 *lenit albescens animos capillus* | *litium et rixae cupidos protervae*; contrast 1017–18n.

λήγει δ' ἔρις recalls, with variation, the Homeric λῆγ' ἔριδος (*Il.* 1.210 (Athena to Achilles), 1.319, 21.359; cf. 9.257). For δραμοῦσα τοῦ προσωτάτω cf. Xen. *An.* 1.3.1 ἵέναι τοῦ πρόσω, K–G 1 385, S–D 11 112. Alternatively, τοῦ προσωτάτω could go with λήγει, but bare δραμοῦσα ‘having run its course’ probably forces too much from the word. The minority variant –άτου was caused by preceding τοῦ; the superlative adjective used adverbially would have to be plural (as at *El.* 391, its only occurrence). πρόσω is accompanied by the article in Herodotus and Aesch. *Sept.* [996–7] (where see Hutchinson). Of the two genitive nouns, λόγου defines ξυναλλαγή, while ἀνδρῶν γερόντων is possessive (53–4n.). For the instrumental dative with ἐν cf. *Ant.* 962 ψαύων τὸν θεὸν ἐν κερτομίσι γλώσσαις, Moorhouse 107. For ξυναλλαγαί opposed to conflict cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 602 διὰ δορὸς εἴπας ἡ λόγων ξυναλλαγαῖς; and LSJ⁹ s.v. συναλλαγὴ 1 i (prose examples).

733 ἀλλ' ἤμιν Αἴας ποῦ ὅστιν, ὡς φράσω τάδε; ‘But where is Ajax, so that I might tell him this?’ The fronting of Αἴας and delay of the interrogative marks the shift of focus (cf. Thomson (1939) 149–50). For ἤμιν (thus Planudes, in Bachmann’s *Anecdota*, 11 66.20, for manuscript ἡμῖν; Jb has ἡμίν) see 216–17n. *ῥ* (*coni.* Dawe¹) for ὡς gives slightly simpler syntax (giving ‘where is Ajax, to whom I might . . .’), perhaps inappropriately for the Messenger (cf. the absence of ὅτι after θέλω in 719).

734 τοῖς κυρίοις γὰρ πάντα χρὴ δηλοῦν λόγον. ‘For I must reveal the whole account to the people concerned.’ τοῖς κυρίοις (*sc.* τοῦ πράγματος) means ‘those who have responsibility in the matter’, as at Aesch. *Cho.* 689 τοῖς κυρίοις καὶ προσήκουσιν λέγων (see Garvie). For a speaker’s declaration that he will tell ‘all things’ see 284n.

735–6 οὐκ ἔνδον, ἀλλὰ φροῦδος ἀρτίως, νέας | βουλὰς νέοισιν ἐγκαταξέυξας τρόποις. ‘He is not inside, but has departed just now, after yoking new counsels to new actions.’ That is, his change of mind has caused him to act in a new way; cf. Cic. *Manil.* 60 *maiores nostros . . . semper ad novos casus temporum novorum consiliorum rationes accommodasse*, where new counsels result from new situations. The metaphor from yoking is hardly rare (24n.), but in this context ‘implies [Ajax’s] self-conquest’ (Jebb).

737 ἰοῦ ἰοῦ: ‘ἰοῦ . . . is associated especially with sudden realizations, whether painful or joyful’ (West (1997) 264); cf. *OR* 1182, *Ti.* 1143, Aesch. *Eum.* 143, Buxton (1982) 116, Davies (2007) 20 (comparing 803 οἱ γῶ). Extrametrical exclamation in dialogue signals strong emotion (cf. *Ant.* 1047a). Most manuscripts

add a further *ιοῦ*, with N adding two (cf. Dawe (1968) 16), but in tragedy and other classical authors (Aristophanes, Plato, Demosthenes) a single repetition is standard (exceptions at Ar. *Pax* 110 and *Av.* 1170, with two and five repetitions respectively, the former metrically guaranteed).

738–9 βραδεῖαν ἡμᾶς ἄρ' ὁ τήνδε τήν ὁδὸν | πέμπων ἔπεμψεν, ἢ φάνην ἐγὼ βραδύς. ‘Too late, then, was this journey on which my dispatcher sent me, or I have turned out to be slow.’ The Messenger reproaches himself for his late arrival: cf. Simon. fr. 243 Poltera βίσιτόν κέ σε μάλλον ὄνασα | πρότερος ἔλθων. The repetition βραδεῖαν... βραδύς has excited suspicion (μάταιον *coni.* Nauck^{5a} and (1874) 291–2, ἀχρεῖον F. Schmidt (1862) 15–16 n. 8; for the anticipatory error see Davies on *Ti.* 88ff.), but the sense is clear. Renchan (1992) 349–50 argues that the Messenger is afraid that he could be killed as the bearer of bad news; hence his alarm and implied criticism of his dispatcher. But throughout his concern is for Ajax’s fate, not his own; and if he was afraid of punishment, he would scarcely admit that he might be culpable.

ἄρα is a substitute for ἄρα, ‘marking realization of the truth, or drawing a conclusion’ (Denniston 45; cf. 980, 1238, 1368).

740 τί δ' ἐστὶ χρεῖας τῆς δ' ὑπεσπανισμένον; ‘And what in this urgent business has been stinted?’ The perfect passive participle of ὑποσπανίζω (elsewhere at Aesch. *Pers.* 489, *Cho.* 577) allows the chorus to concentrate on the problem at hand without apportioning blame. The force of ὑπο– is unclear; the context of the *Persae* passage rules out the sense ‘slightly’.

741–2 τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀπηλύδα Τεῦκρος ἔνδοθεν στέγης | μὴ ξῶ παρῆναι, πρὶν παρῶν αὐτὸς τύχη. ‘Teucer forbids the man to be allowed out from inside the hut, before he himself arrives.’ παρῆναι (< παρήμι) for manuscript παρήκειν is owed to Hartung. The latter is unattested in tragedy and does not make sense. LSJ⁹ s.v. παρήκω II invent a heading for our passage (‘pass in any direction’); other unparalleled suggestions include ‘go forth in public’ (Lobeck^{2–3}) or ‘pass along (viz. a watch which has to prevent this)’ (Kamerbeek). Such meanings obscure Teucer’s message ‘don’t let Ajax out’. παρῆναι is paralleled by Eur. *Suppl.* 467–8 ἐγὼ δ' ἀπαυδῶ... | Ἀδραστον ἐς γῆν τήνδε μὴ παρίεναι (cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. V, ‘allow to pass’); cf. also ἀφίημι at 754 and 796. Perhaps a gloss ἦκειν was written above –εῖναι as if that were a part of λέναι, and later insinuated itself into the text (28n.). παρῆκειν in H (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 5; for the error cf. *Phil.* 1048) gives inappropriate sense (‘yield’; thus Ll-J/W, *So.*).

ἔνδοθεν στέγης appears in the same sense at Eur. fr. 781.46 *TiGF.* παρῶν has the additional nuance ‘present to help’ (cf. 1288, *El.* 300n., Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 548; also 92n.).

743–4 ἀλλ' οἴχεταιί τοι, πρὸς τὸ κέρδιον τραπείς | γνώμης, θεοῖσιν ὥς καταλ-
λαχθῇ χόλου. ‘But he is gone, I tell you, after turning to more profitable

thoughts, to make an end of his anger against the gods.’ κέρδιον gives better sense than the majority reading κέρδιστον: Ajax has ‘taken a turn for the better’ (Dawe, *STS* 150). The same type of corruption occurs at 1011 and Eur. *Her.* 856; cf. Fraenkel (1957) 20 n. 4 on the confusion of –τερος and –τατος. For the partitive genitive with γνώμης cf. Thuc. 1.90.2, Antiph. 2.γ.3; also *El.* 922n. I illustrate the construction in θεοῖσιν ὡς καταλλαχθῆι χόλου at 715–18n.

745–6 ταῦτ’ ἐστὶ τᾶπη μωρίας πολλῆς πλέα, | εἴπερ τι Κάλχας εὖ φρονῶν μαντεύεται. ‘These words are full of great foolishness, if Calchas has any wisdom in his prophecy.’ The opposition between μωρίας... εὖ φρονῶν in the context of prophecy recurs at *OR* 435–6 (Tiresias to Oedipus) ἡμεῖς τοιοῖδ’ ἔφουμεν, ὡς μὲν σοὶ δοκεῖ, | μῶροι, γονεῦσι δ’, οἳ σ’ ἔφυσαν, ἐμφρονες. For the combination μωρίας... πλέα cf. 1150, *El.* 607 ἀναιδείας πλέαν, *Phil.* 876 δυσσομίας γέμων, Long (1968) 107 (‘the periphrasis is more forceful than the simple adjective’). εἴπερ (not a marker of doubt: cf. 783, *El.* 1425 Ἀπόλλων εἰ καλῶς ἐθέσπισεν with n.) and τι ominously understate Calchas’ reliability; Hom. *Il.* 1.73 predicates εὖ φρονέων of him in a context emphasising that quality. While the sense there is different (‘with good intentions’), the effect may be to recall that occasion, when his prophecy proved all too accurate.

747 ποῖον; τί δ’ εἰδῶς τοῦδε πράγματος πέρι; ‘What prophecy? What does he know about this matter?’ For ποῖον; followed by a τί-question (here with μαντεύεται understood from 746) cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 410 ποῖον; τί τοῦτ’ ἔλεξας; The mention of Calchas’ prophecy prompts the chorus to ask what the all-knowing seer, ὅς εἶδη τά τ’ ἐόντα τά τ’ ἐσσόμενα πρό τ’ ἐόντα (Hom. *Il.* 1.70), is aware of. The idiomatic emphasis on the seer’s knowledge (cf. *OR* 317–18, 330, Eur. *Hel.* 13–14, 823, Virg. *Aen.* 6.66) leads me to reject πάρεῖ (*coni.* Schneidewin¹ and (1849) 466), which puts the focus on what the Messenger knows. Moreover, as Pearson (1923) 25 points out, it would be awkward for πάρεῖ to be followed by παρών in 748 when they do not refer to the same occasion.

Eitrem (1912) 71–2 takes τί... πέρι as an utterance interrupted by a hasty Messenger (*prob.* Fraenkel (1977) 26); but ‘this moment in the play is not so highly-wrought as to make this plausible’ (Dawe, *STS* 150). Reiske (1753) 5 restores a verb by changing δ’ εἰδῶς to δέδις, but Calchas’ knowledge, not the Messenger’s emotional state, is important here. Jouanna (1991) 563 suggests ποῖόν τι δ’ εἰδῶς; for ποῖόν τι in a question cf. *OC* 1163, Eur. *IT* 1030, and also *Ant.* 42, Eur. *Ion* 333, 992, *Ba.* 806. But δέ (needed to avoid hiatus) is unwelcome.

748–83 The audience already knows from the stichomythia, on the authority of Calchas, that Ajax should stay indoors. They now learn that this enforced

domesticity need only last for today, since that will be the duration of Athena's anger against him (752–7, 778–9). Calchas' communication of this news to Teucer makes clear his good intentions (749–55); this provides the consolation that Ajax still has friends in the camp, but also highlights the criticism of his past conduct, which now comes from a friendly source (cf. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 13). Over half the speech, its central section, is devoted to this subject, in order to motivate the goddess's rage. Through the Messenger, Calchas describes Ajax's defiance of his father (762–70) and Athena (770–7). The perspective recedes back to before Ajax arrived at Troy, revealing that even then, arrogance was fundamental to his character (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 40–1), and refuting the chorus's distinction between Ajax when he set out for the war and after the Judgment of the Arms (596–645n.).

News of Athena's anger comes more than half-way through the drama, as S. maintains suspense through the technique of partial revelation (719–47n.). The delay, far from reducing the importance of the news (thus the scholars cited by Winnington-Ingram (1980) 12–13 n. 4), serves to emphasise it; there are similar effects at *Tk* 1159–61 (where also the 'announcement of the prophecy arrives too late': Hose (2006) 93) and *Hom. Il.* 9.410–15, both of which involve the uncovering of divine foreknowledge some way into a work. (See also Davies (1981) on the reasons for Homer's delay in mentioning the Judgment of Paris until book 24; he cites tragic parallels on p. 57 n. 6.) Ajax's present peril is revealed to be the result of long-standing, merited divine rage. News that Athena's anger will last only for one day emphasises this decisive moment; her remark in the prologue on the power of a day to change human fortune turns out to have far-reaching importance (131–2n.). This limitation 'allows the chorus and Tecmessa just enough hope so that their reaction is a sense of urgency rather than static despair' (Gardiner (1987) 68; cf. Rehm (2002) 347 n. 57). More generally, 'as the action of a Greek play normally takes place in a single day . . . the idea of "today" as the fateful day often serves as a leitmotif' (A/O on *Ar. Thesm.* 71, citing Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Hippolytus* as well as our play; see further West on *Eur. Or.* 48). Athena's anger does not thereby lose its significance; on the contrary. Against Garvie (2005) 15, who complains 'how . . . can we take seriously a divine anger that will last only for today?', M. Heath (2007) 114 counters 'how can we not take it seriously if a day is long enough to accomplish Athene's purpose?'

748 τοσοῦτον οἶδα καὶ παρὼν ἐτύγχανον. 'So much do I know, and I was there.' παρὼν stresses the Messenger's reliability as an eyewitness: cf. *Ant.* 1192–3 ἐγὼ, φίλη δέσποινα, καὶ παρὼν ἔρῳ, | κοῦδὲν παρήσω τῆς ἀληθείας ἔπος, De Jong (1991) 9 with n. 20, J. Barrett (2002) 74–5. Blaydes' prints οἶδ' ἔπει; the sense is good, but the transmitted coordination is paralleled by *Ant.* 1192–3.

749–52 ἐκ γὰρ συνέδρου καὶ τυραννικοῦ κύκλου | Κάλχας μεταστὰς οἶος Ἀτρειδῶν δίχα, | εἰς χεῖρα Τεύκρου δεξιᾶν φιλοφρόνως | θεῖς ‘Drawing apart from the circle of chieftains in council, on his own and apart from the Atridae, Calchas put his right hand into Teucer’s in a kindly way.’ Calchas’ separation from the Greek leaders, especially the Atridae, suggests that his message will be helpful to Ajax; his friendly gesture confirms this. At least one member of the army still wishes Ajax well. In earlier literature Calchas delivers two prophecies which cause pain to Agamemnon: at Aulis, requiring the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and at Troy, requiring the release of Briseis. But while Agamemnon can react angrily to such prophecies (cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.106–8; contrast Aesch. *Ag.* 186), nothing in the tradition suggests enmity on Calchas’ part towards Agamemnon.

For γάρ see 285–7n. ‘Shaking hands is not a casual greeting among the Greeks, but a pledge of affection and loyalty’ (Dover on Ar. *Ran.* 754 ἐμβαλέ μοι τὴν δεξιάν); ‘a man’s willingness to clasp the other’s right hand became the outward display of surety that his word, in the form of a promise, could be trusted’ (Allan (2007) 115 with 245–6 n. 13). Cf. *Ti.* 1181 ἐμβαλλε χεῖρα δεξιάν πρώτιστά μοι, *Phil.* 813, *OC* 1632–3, Eur. *Med.* 21–2 with Flory (1978), Ar. *Nub.* 81 τὴν χεῖρα δὸς τὴν δεξιάν, Hom. *Il.* 6.233 χεῖράς τ’ ἀλλήλων λαβέτην καὶ πιστώσαντο (signalling friendship between enemies), *Od.* 11.247 ἐν τ’ ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί (Poseidon giving a promise to Tyro), Kaimio (1988) 26, and (for this gesture in art) Neumann (1965) 49–58, Johnston and McNiven (1996) 27–30. Calchas’ spontaneous gesture eloquently contrasts with the violent assault which Teucer has just experienced.

752–5 εἶπε κατέσκηψε παντοῖα τέχνη | εἶρξαι κατ’ ἡμᾶρ τοῦμφανὲς τὸ νῦν τόδε | Αἶανθ’ ὑπὸ σκηναῖσι μὴδ’ ἀφέντ’ ἔαν, | εἰ ζῶντ’ ἐκεῖνον εἰσιδεῖν θέλοι ποτέ. ‘and spoke and solemnly charged him to keep Ajax in the hut by every means at his disposal, and not to let him out, during this day whose light is now shining, if he ever wanted to see him alive.’ παντοῖα τέχνη (which goes with what follows, as Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1036 notes) may be an elevated variant on πάση τέχνῃ, which is common in comedy (A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 64–5, who also cite examples from Herodotus (a herdsman’s wife), Xenophon, and Lysias): S. combines the urgency of everyday speech with the dignity of tragedy.

According to Eustathius 1387.3 (1 13.22–3 Stallbaum), εἶργω means ‘keep away’ (κωλύω), εἶργω ‘shut up’ (ἐγκλείω). The usual senses of ἀπείργω and καθεῖργω support this distinction (cf. Lobeck, Dawe, *STS* 1 150 n. 4, West’s Teubner Aeschylus, pp. xlvī–xlvii). When we find the rarer forms ἀφείργω and κατεῖργω, their meanings also fit the Eustathian doctrine (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 447, *Eum.* 566, Eur. *Med.* 1258–9). West suggests that the rough breathing in the sense ‘shut up’ may be the result of analogy with ἔρκος. Jebb defends εἶρξαι, on the ground that ‘the sense [is] “to *restrain*,” rather than definitely “to *shut*

in'''. This is false, but even if true, would still require εἰρξαι. For ἀφέντ' ἔαν cf. Eur. fr. 974.2 *TrGF* ἀφεις ἔξ, 463.2, *El.* [379].

756–7 ἔλξ γὰρ αὐτὸν τήνδ' ἔθ' ἡμέραν μόνην | δίας Ἀθάνας μῆνις, ὡς ἔφη λέγων. 'For the anger of divine Athena will pursue him during this day alone, as he declared in his speech.' Grenfell and Hunt (1919) published the reading of Π³,]ἡμέραν μόνην, suggesting [τήνδ' ἔθ'] or [τήνδε γ'] for the lacuna. The mediaeval tradition has τῇδε θ' ἡμέρᾳ μόνῃ (Markland (1758–76) suggests τῇδ' ἐν or τῇδ' ἔθ'; Zu has the latter), which Brunck wrote as θῆμέρᾳ with crasis (cf. 778, 1362, *OR* 1283, *Ar. Av.* 1072, and *Thesm.* 76; the comic instances are both formal-sounding). The accusative marking duration (Moorhouse 44) emphasises the period during which the persecution will last, and was more likely to be corrupted into the dative (the syntax of which was more obvious) than the reverse. The similar dative phrases at 778 and 1362 may also have led to the corruption. For confusion of –αν and –α see 567–70n. For the loss of ἔθ' see 523–4n.

δῖος recurs as an epithet of Athena at Telestes fr. 805(a).3 *PMG*. For μῆνις see 654–6n. Pleonastic ὡς ἔφη λέγων is common in verse and prose (cf. Kieckers (1915) 34–7, Dunbar on *Ar. Av.* 472, Fraenkel on *Aesch. Ag.* 205). Most manuscripts accentuate not ὡς but ὦς (= οὔτως; for the confusion cf. *El.* 126–7n.), but the resulting pause before the phrase would have an unwelcome staccato effect.

758–61 τὰ γὰρ περισσὰ κἀνόνητα σώματα | πίπτειν βαρείαις πρὸς θεῶν δυσπραξίαις | ἔφασχ' ὁ μάντις, ὅστις ἀνθρώπου φύσιν | βλαστῶν ἔπειτα μὴ κατ' ἀνθρώπων φρονῇ. 'For bodies grown to unprofitable excess fall through grievous misfortunes sent by the gods, the prophet declared – whoever is of mortal nature, but then fails to think thoughts fitting for a mortal.' The prophet restates and elaborates Athena's words at 127–33. The warning 'think mortal thoughts' is a commonplace, often (as here) expressed through polyptoton: cf. fr. 346 *TrGF* καλὸν φρονεῖν τὸν θνητὸν ἀνθρώποις ἴσα, *Tr. Adesp.* fr. 76a *TrGF* ἀνθρώπων ὄντα δεῖ φρονεῖν ἀνθρώπινα, *Eur. Alc.* 799, *Pind. I.* 5.16, [*Epicharm.*] fr. 251 *PCG*, *Gygli-Wyss* (1966) 103 n. 3, Rosenbloom (2001) 119–20 n. 28; contrast *Arist. EN* 1177b31–4. For μὴ κατ' ἀνθρώπων φρονῇ cf. 777, *Ant.* 768 φρονεῖτω μείζον ἢ κατ' ἀνδρ' ἰών, *OC* 598 τί γὰρ τὸ μείζον ἢ κατ' ἀνθρώπων νοσεῖς; *Aesch. Sept.* 425 ὁ κόμπος δ' οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπων φρονεῖ, *Eur. Hipp.* 641 φρονούσα πλείον' ἢ γυναιῖκα χρή, *Held.* 979, Headlam on *Herodas* 4.69. The gap between mortal and immortal thoughts also appears at *Hom. Il.* 5.440–2 and *Isaiah* 55.8–9.

σῶμα can mean just 'person' (*LSJ*⁹ s.v. II 2), but here and at 1077–8 it probably stresses Ajax's corporeality, for which cf. 1250–2. (Contrast the chorus at 154–61, where μέγας predicated of Ajax refers to stature, not size.) It picks up a motif from the *Iliad*, which repeatedly stresses the immense bulk of his

shield (18–19n.). For the huge size of some ancient heroes more generally see West (2007) 425–6. For the idea that the gods target what is big cf. Hdt. 7.10ε.

There is a variant κᾶνότηα (Zc^{ac} and Chalcondylas, in his edition of the *Suda*, s.v. τὰ γάρ; Adler τ 9 = IV 494.18–19 does not list this as a variant manuscript reading, so it may be Ch.’s conjecture), also implied by the gloss ὁφρονᾶ. But as Jebb points out, ‘σώματα confirms ἀνόνητα: the idea is that of greatness which, swollen beyond the human limit, has ceased to fulfil the proper function of mankind. Such σώματα are ἀνόνητα *because* περισσά.’ Cf. Isocr. 12.77 τὰ μὲν περιττὰ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τερατώδη καὶ μὴδὲν ὠφελούντα τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερεῖδε. The emphasis on Ajax’s mental state and attitude (e.g. 761, 763, 766, 777) prompted the error. At 1272 manuscripts are evenly split between the two forms.

Instead of δυσπραξίαις Stobaeus (3.22.21.2 = III 588.16 W–H) attests δυσπραγίαις. While the latter stem is classical (Aesch. *Ag* 790; also εὐπραγία at e.g. Pind. *O.* 8.14, Thuc. 5.46.1), it is by far the commoner in Imperial and Byzantine Greek, and so prone to be introduced in error. Π³ may have read the phrase in the singular, but the plural is preferable for the generalised statement.

ὅστις looks back to σώματα by the sense construction (356–357/8n.). Instead of φύσιν Stobaeus (1.3.20.3, 3.22.21.3 = I 56.2, III 589.1 W–H) offers φύσει, which will result from failure to construe the accusative of respect. The variant γεγώς for βλαστών shows substitution of a commoner word of similar shape and meaning (56–8n.). For the absence of ἄν with subjunctive φρονῇ cf. 1074 (perhaps), 1081, *El.* 771n. The lack of the particle may have encouraged the spread of the variant –ει: cf. [812], 1081 (where παρῇ becomes πάρα in some manuscripts), *OR* 317 (λύη ~ λύει). In each case LK have the subjunctive, as does Π³ here.

762–70 The fraught moment when a soldier departs for war was a favourite of vase-painters, who often depicted young men poignantly clasping their father’s hand (Matheson (2005) 25–6). An Attic amphora from c. 425–400 (Touchefeu (1981) §15) shows Ajax saying farewell to Telamon and his wife, with Teucer departing on the other side (the painter names the men, confusing Teucer and Telamon). An Attic kylix from c. 520–500 (Touchefeu §14) shows Ajax, armed and next to a chariot, saying farewell to an old man labelled]ΑΛΟΣ (possibly Paralos, the Attic hero, as a substitute father: thus C. Smith (1896) 52).

Homer twice describes a father’s advice to his son departing for Troy, both times recounted by a third party in a paraenetic context: Peleus to Achilles, narrated by Phoenix (*Il.* 9.252–9), and Menoetius to Patroclus, narrated by Nestor (11.782–90). Nestor also mentions Peleus’ advice to Achilles, αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων (11.784); Hippolochus delivers the same recommendation to Glaucus, accompanied by a warning not to disgrace his

family (6.208–10). Peleus' speech to Achilles is closest to our case, and the comparison is to Ajax's disadvantage (see following nn.).

762–3 κείνος δ' ἅπ' οἴκων εὐθύς ἐξορμώμενος | ἄνους καλῶς λέγοντος ἡῦρέθη πατρός. 'At the very moment that he was setting out from home, he was found to be foolish despite the wise advice of his father.' For the emphasis on this significant moment cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.252–3 ἥ μὲν σοί γε πατήρ ἐπετέλλετο Πηλεΐς | ἥματι τῷ, ὅτε σ' ἐκ Φθίης Ἀγαμέμνονι πέμπεν. Dindorf³ prints ἡῦρέθη for transmitted εὐρέθη (119–20n.).

764–5 ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐννέπει, “τέκνον, δορί | βούλου κρατεῖν μὲν, σὺν θεῷ δ' αἰεὶ κρατεῖν.” ‘For he addressed him, “My son, desire to triumph with the spear, but to triumph always with a god's help.”’ Peleus' advice to Achilles is longer (Hom. *Il.* 9.254–8): τέκνον ἐμόν, κάρτος μὲν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρῃ | δώσουσ', αἶ κ' ἐθέλωσι, σὺ δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμόν | ἴσχειν ἐν στήθεσσι· φιλοφροσύνη γὰρ ἀμείνων· | ληγέμεναι δ' ἔριδος κακομηχάνου, ὄφρα σε μάλλον | τίωσ' Ἀργείων ἡμὲν νέοι ἡδὲ γέροντες. There too the gods provide κράτος (cf. 765, 768), although Peleus emphasises Achilles' relations with his fellow men. Ajax's father feels the need to remind his son of a more fundamental point of ancient morality.

For ἐννέπω with the accusative cf. K–G 1 295 Anm. 3. CH reverse τέκνον δορί through *vitium Byzantinum* (302–4n.). For the choice of δορί over Dindorf's δόρει (1825 edn) see 516–17n. For σὺν θεῷ see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 168–9, adding Solon fr. 34.6 *IEG* ἃ μὲν γὰρ εἶπα, σὺν θεοῖσιν ἦνυσσας; contrast 778–9n.

766–9 ὁ δ' ὑπικόμπως ἀφρόνως ἡμίψατο, | “πάτερ, θεοῖς μὲν κἂν ὁ μὴδὲν ὦν ὁμοῦ | κράτος κατακτήσται· ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ δίχα | κείνων πέποιθα τοῦτ' ἐπισπάσειν κλέος.” ‘But he gave an answer that was arrogant and mad: “Father, with the gods even a worthless man can acquire success. I am confident that I will win this glory even without them.”’ In the *Iliad* Phoenix does not describe a reply by Achilles to Peleus at the time of his departure, but warns him tactfully that he is now ‘forgetting’ his father's advice (9.259 ὥς ἐπέτελλ' ὁ γέρων, σὺ δὲ λήθεις). Ajax is more explicitly antagonistic, picking up his father's words (κρατεῖν ~ κράτος, σὺν θεῷ ~ δίχα κείνων), and mirroring the structure of his utterance (opening bare vocative followed by μὲν . . . δέ construction).

For ἀφρόνως see 758–61n. δίχα κείνων hovers between ‘without’ and ‘in defiance of’ the gods: cf. *OC* 47–8 πόλεως | δίχα (‘without the sanction of the city’). The absence of negation is remarkable: great feats are typically achieved ‘not without the help of the gods’ (cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 164 and Eur. *Ba.* 764 οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τινος, Hom. *Od.* 18.353 οὐκ ἄθελί, Simon. fr. 259 Poltera οὕτως ἄνευ<θε> θεῶν ἀρετὰν λάβεν | οὐ πόλις οὐ βροτός, with P's n., p. 203, Pind. *P.* 5.76 οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ, Bühler on Moschus 2.152, West (1997) 224 with

n. 17). Ajax's Locrian namesake makes a similarly disastrous vaunt in the *Odyssey* (4.504 φῆ ῥ' ἄκητι θεῶν φυγέειν μέγα λαΐτμα θαλάσσης); while Capaneus was notorious for such impious boasting (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 427–9 θεοῦ τε γὰρ θέλοντος ἐκπέρσειν πόλιν | καὶ μὴ θέλοντός φησιν, οὐδὲ τὴν Διὸς | ἔριν πέδοι σκήψασαν ἐμποδῶν σχεθεῖν, Eur. *Suppl.* 498–9, *Phoen.* 1175–6).

For generic μηδὲν ὦν cf. 1094, 1114, Moorhouse (1965) 34–6; contrast 1231n., 1273–6n. Instead of κατακτήσaiτ' L^{ac}K. offer καταστήσaiτ', probably via uncial confusion; less probably the latter is original ('get for oneself': cf. Hdt. 8.105.1 τὴν ζήν κατεστήσατο ἀπ' ἔργων ἀνοσιωτάτων, cited by LSJ⁹ s.v. καθίστημι A II 5). For ἐπισπάω 'win, acquire' cf. Hesych. ε 5201 (II 171 Latte = S. fr. 141 *TrGF*) ἐπισπάσει· ἐπιτεύζεται with Pearson, LSJ⁹ s.v. I 4 (citing examples in the middle).

770 τοσόνδ' ἐκόμπει μῦθον. 'So proud was his boast.' τοσόσδε refers to tone (cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1174 τοσόνδ' ἐκόμπασεν, of Capaneus), not (as usual) size: cf. 1049, 386n., Macleod on Hom. *Il.* 24.141–2 ('πολλά does not so much imply a long exchange as one full of import').

770–3 εἶτα δεύτερον | δίας Ἀθάνας, ἡνίκ' ὀτρύνουσα νιν | ἡῦδ' ἔπ' ἐχθροῖς χεῖρα φοινίαν τρέπειν, | τότ' ἀντιφωνεῖ δεινὸν ἄρρητόν τ' ἔπος. 'Then, on a second occasion, in the case of divine Athena, as she urged him on and told him to turn his bloody hand against the enemy, at that moment he uttered in reply a dire and unspeakable saying.' The original offence is repeated (δεύτερον) and exacerbated (defiance of a manifest divinity): Ajax's contempt for the gods is a basic aspect of his character, not an isolated error (thus C. Müller (1999a) 494 = (1999b) 184).

δίας Ἀθάνας is a genitive of respect (thus Campbell), for which Renehan (1992) 350–1 compares Eur. *Andr.* 361–2 ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν τοιοῖδε· τῆς δὲ σῆς φρενός, | ἔν σου δέδοικα, Xen. *Oec.* 3.11, and Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 950. The construction marks the change to a new subject; having heard what Ajax said to his father, the audience await his response to a figure demanding even more respect. Others make the phrase depend on ἀντιφωνεῖ, or take it as an incomplete genitive absolute. In the former the genitive is unexampled and the syntax repugnant (given the gap between the verb and its supposed object), while the latter interpretation sounds desperate and remains unparalleled.

The same phrase occurs, in the same position, at 757, only a few lines before our passage; the unusual syntax makes it possible that the phrase has displaced the original beginning of 771. This need not have had any resemblance to δίας Ἀθάνας; which is just as well, since conjectures based on the transmitted letters are unpersuasive (δῖαν Ἀθάναν Mehlhorn (1845) 139 n. 6, μύθοις Ἀθάνας Heimsoeth (1865) 69, Αἶας Ἀθάναν anon. *ap.* Dawe¹). A reference to Athena is desirable, since otherwise ὀτρύνουσα is too sudden and its subject unclear until 774. One possibility is θεᾶς ἀκούσας, next to which a scribe might have

written δῖος Ἀθήνας to indicate the identification of this goddess with the figure last mentioned in 757. Alternatively, we could supply a construction for δῖος Ἀθήνας by supposing a lacuna before 771. (Jebb suggests replacing δεύτερον with δ' ἄντιον, but as discussed above, the numeral is essential.)

The coordination ἥνικ' . . . τότ' stresses the impiety: Ajax defies the goddess at the very moment that she brings him help. The variants δδ' and τόδ' (H, *coni.* Pierson (pre-1759) 196 verso; for the latter corruption cf. *OR* 1142, *Ant.* 480, and, in reverse, *Phil.* 663, *OC* 941) for τότ' probably result from scribes taking the sense of the line in isolation. For χεῖρα φοινίαν cf. *El.* 1422, *Eur. Med.* 864, 1253–4. The prefix in ἀντιφώνει can denote simply 'reply to' (cf. *Ti.* 1114), but also (as here) conveys the idea of disagreement (*Ant.* 271, *El.* 1501, *Phil.* 1065). The minority variant ἀντεφώνει (*coni.* ed. Lond. 1722) replaces the vivid historic present with an unattractive imperfect.

774–5 “ἄνασσα, τοῖς ἄλλοισιν Ἀργείων πέλας | ἴστω, καθ' ἡμᾶς δ' οὐποτ' ἔκρηξείτ' μάχη.” ‘Lady, stand beside the other Argives, but in my sector the battle will never †break out†.’ Ajax’s refusal of divine assistance (ironically contrasting with his address to Athena at 91–2) is an arrogant act likely to end in disaster. Against this view, March (1991–3) 10 argues that ‘the audience would have recognized that what Ajax said was absolutely and literally true’ and ‘in the *Iliad* Ajax does win glory quite without the gods’ help’. Her former statement is false, her latter irrelevant. (i) No human fighter, even an Ajax, can hold a line of battle indefinitely (οὐποτε) without supernatural aid. In the *Iliad*, Ajax is more than once worn down and forced to conduct a fighting retreat (11.544–74, 15.727–46) or withdraw altogether (16.102–11 Αἴας δ' οὐκέτ' ἔμμινε· βιάζετο γὰρ βελέεσσιν κτλ. (= 15.727), 16.122 χάζετο δ' ἔκ βελέων). (ii) There is nothing impious in gaining success without the direct intervention of the gods, as Ajax does in the *Iliad*. What is impious is refusing their help when it is offered, and for that March offers no parallel.

πέλας with the dative is paralleled in all three tragedians and in Pindar; see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 208. For gods ‘standing near’ their protégés see 92n. My translation of καθ' ἡμᾶς is owed to West (1978a) 113 (citing *OC* 377, [*Eur.*] *Rhes.* 726). This gives the required opposition with τοῖς ἄλλοισιν Ἀργείων πέλας | ἴστω. Other stations need Athena’s help, but not this one.

Transmitted ἐκρήξει means ‘break out’; the sense required is ‘break in’, ‘collapse’. West (1978a) 113 suggests εἰσρήξει, arguing that ‘μάχη is . . . “the fighting” as a mobile entity . . . [citing Hom. *Il.* 6.2, 16.246]. We need an indication of the direction in which, in Ajax’s neighbourhood, it will not roll.’ Although virtually unattested (Dositheus vii 434.28 *GL* glosses *irrumpe* with εἰσρήσσω), the formation is natural enough. Ll-J/W prefer another unparalleled verb, ἐνρήξει (for confusion of ἐν– and ἐκ– see Davies on *Ti.* 368, Arnott on Alexis fr. 24.3 *PCG*, p. 119), but the prefix is inferior. Krüger

(1870) tries ἐκλήξει (*prob.* Budelmann (1999) 171–2, citing *Il.* 19.423 οὐ λήξω πρὶν Τρῳᾶς ὄδην ἐλάσαι πολέμοιο), which gives the sense ‘near me fighting will never end’, but omits Ajax’s steadfastness. Bare ῥήξει (*coni.* Blaydes¹) is unattractive; Dawe (*STS* 1 150–1) posits tmesis with καθ’, removing the contrast between καθ’ ἡμᾶς and the preceding phrase.

776–7 τοιοῖσδε τοι λόγοισιν ἄστεργῇ θεᾷς | ἐκτήσατ’ ὀργήν, οὐ κατ’ ἀνθρωπῶν φρονῶν. ‘With such words, I tell you, he incurred the implacable anger of the goddess, by not thinking mortal thoughts.’ The chorus’s talk about Ajax ‘making an end of his anger against the gods’ (743–4) now looks especially complacent: Athena’s anger against Ajax is the real threat. Divine wrath is regularly the consequence of ‘an insult offered to the god, or a boast or challenge indicating that the mortal fails to appreciate the god’s complete superiority’ (West (1997) 124, with examples). τοι (thus Valckenaer (pre-1775)) drives home the moral (cf. Denniston 537); transmitted τοῖς is weaker. For the corruption (facilitated by the surrounding datives) cf. *El.* 308n., *Ar. Av.* 1438.

στέργω can mean ‘love’ or ‘acquiesce in’ (Finglass (2009e) 86 with n. 6); my translation is based on the latter. Anger which ‘does not acquiesce’, ‘cannot be satisfied’, is aptly attributed to a goddess. If the stem means ‘love’, there are two weaker possibilities: the active ‘not loving’, and hence ‘immitis’ (Camerarius), and the passive ‘not loved’, and hence ‘unenviable’ (Campbell), ‘not to be desired’ (Jebb). The latter sense occurs in S.’s other use of the word, at *OR* 228–9 πείσεται . . . ἄλλο . . . | ἄστεργές οὐδέν (‘he will suffer no other unpleasantness’: Dawe). But the milder meaning there suits Oedipus’ encouragement to the malefactor to come forward; Athena’s anger needs no such euphemism. *Lyc. Alex.* 1166 ἄστεργῇ χόλον, the only other occurrence, probably comes from our passage.

For ἐκτήσατ’ ὀργήν cf. *Ant.* 924 τὴν δυσσέβειαν εὐσεβοῦς ἐκτησάμην, *Aesch. Sept.* [1017–18] ἄγος . . . κεκτήσεται | θεῶν πατρώων, *Eur. Med.* 218, *IT* 676; also *S. El.* 968–9n. For οὐ κατ’ ἀνθρωπῶν φρονῶν see 758–61n.

778–9 ἀλλ’ εἴπερ ἔστι τῇδ’ ἔθ’ ἡμέρᾳ, τάχ’ ἂν | γενοίμεθ’ αὐτοῦ σὺν θεῷ σωτήριοι. ‘But if he is still alive on this day, we might prove to be his salvation, with the god’s help.’ σὺν θεῷ expresses the speaker’s piety (764–5n.), but bodes ill here: Ajax is in peril because he refused to act σὺν θεῷ.

τῇδ’ ἔθ’ ἡμέρᾳ (Zu, *coni.* Markland (1758–76); Brunck prefers τῇδε θῆ ἡμέρᾳ) improves on the majority reading τῇδέ θ’ ἡμέρᾳ, since ‘still’ adds to the urgency, as probably at 756; the repetition of ἔτι may have a closural effect (cf. 761 ~ 777, 760 ~ 780). Van Erp Taalman Kip (2007) 465 n. 3 rejects it on the ground that ‘in this case ἔτι is less essential’; but since it improves sense and structure without altering the paradosis, we should not hesitate to adopt it. The variant τῇδ’ ἐν shows corruption to a common tragic phrase (cf. *Tr.* 740, *El.* 674, *OC* 1612, *Eur. Med.* 1231, *Hipp.* 726, *Or.* 858, *Phoen.* [1263], fr. 773.74 *TrGF*); cf.

523–4n. For the genitive αὐτοῦ with σωτήριοι cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 701, possibly Eur. *Phoen.* 1092 (v.l.).

780–2 τοσαῦθ' ὁ μάντις εἶφ' ὁ δ' εὐθύς ἐξ ἔδρας | πέμπει μέ σοι φέροντα
τάσδ' ἐπιστολάς | Τεῦκρος φυλάσσειν. 'Thus far spoke the prophet. Teucer
sent me straight from where he sat, bearing this message to you to observe.'
For τοσαῦτα with a verb of speaking cf. *OC* 1645, Aesch. *Pers.* 372, LSJ⁹
s.v. τοσοῦτος II. The variant τοιαῦθ' would mean 'words like this', raising
unwelcome doubts over the accuracy of the account; for the corruption cf.
681. The **a** group is correct against LK (and others), as later in 778 and 780,
which suggests that it descends from an especially accurate tradition here
(*contra* Dawe, *STS* I 151, calling εἶφ' 'doubtless a metrical emendation').

Teucer sends the Messenger εὐθύς ἐξ ἔδρας, 'straight from where he [i.e. Teucer] sat', an expression paralleled by Isocr. 12.211 καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν εὐθύς ἐξ εὐνῆς ἐκπέμπουσι τοὺς παῖδας . . . ἐπὶ κλωπεῖαν ('straight from their beds'), Thuc. 6.62.4 Νικίας δὲ εὐθύς ἐξ Ὑκκάρων ἐπὶ Ἐγέστης παραπλεύσας ('sailed straight from' *recte* Crawley, Jowett, Dover; not 'sailed immediately'); it also recalls Hom. *Il.* 19.76–7 μετέειπεν . . . | αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἔδρας, οὐδ' ἐν μέσσοισιν ἀναστὰς and *Od.* 13.55–6 ἔσπεισαν . . . | αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἑδρέων. Teucer does not even stand up to give his command, so urgent is the situation. The Greek could also mean 'straight from where I [i.e. the Messenger] sat', but the emphasis on his posture would be pointless. Jebb prefers 'immediately on rising from his seat', but his alleged parallels, εὐθύς ἐξ ἀρχῆς (Isocr. 4.49) and εὐθύς ἐκ νέου (Pl. *Resp.* 485d), have a temporal sense ('right from the beginning/their youth, and onwards') which would not fit here ('right from the moment he sat, up until the present').

The hyperbaton ὁ . . . Τεῦκρος can be paralleled (cf. 311); F. Schmidt (1886–7) I 115 transposes πέμπει and Τευκρός, but we do not want the key act of sending relegated to the end of the sentence, and (so JD) με fits better after πέμπει than Τευκρός. For φυλάσσω 'observe' (a command) see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 179 φυλάξαι τὰμ' ἔπη and (for related senses) LSJ⁹ s.v. B 3.

782–3 εἰ δ' ἀπεστερήμεθα, | οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ κείνος, εἰ Κάλχας σοφός. 'But if we are frustrated, that man is no more, if Calchas is wise.' After ἀπεστερήμεθα understand τὰς ἐπιστολάς φυλάσσειν; for the ellipse Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 577 cites e.g. *Andr.* 913 κᾶκτεινας, ἥ τις συμφορά σ' ἀφείλετο; Badham's ἄρ' ὑστερήσομεν ('if indeed we are late', in his edition of Euripides' *IT* and *Helen*, Praefatio p. 20) is paralleled by Eur. *Phoen.* 975–6 κἂν μὲν φθάσωμεν, ἔστι σοι σωτηρία: | ἦν δ' ὑστερήσης, οἰχόμεσθα, κατθανῇ; the verb is found elsewhere in tragedy at *Phoen.* [1282] and perhaps *Ion* 300. For the corruption Dawe, *STS* I 151, compares *El.* 1210, where εἰ στερήσομαι becomes ὑστερήσομαι in Zr, and Eur. *IA* 1203, where editors adopt Reiske's ἔστερήσομαι for transmitted ὑστ—. But Badham's text involves apparently independent changes at the beginning

and the end of the word, and introduces a particle combination (εἰ δ' ἄρα) unattested for drama. The alternative emendations ἄρ' ὑστερήμεθα (Schenkla *ap. Schubert*¹ p. vii) and ἀφυστερήμεθα (Markland (1758–76)) are even less plausible, since these mediopassive stems are not found until the Imperial period; the latter verb is not attested even in the active before Polybius.

Heimsoeth (1865) 54 suggests ἔστ' ἔθ' for ἔστιν, which is plausible, since elided ἔτι is prone to disappear (523–4n.), but not compelling. For εἰ see 745–6n. For ἀνήρ (Brunck) see 9–10n.

784–802 Tecmessa enters too late to hear the Messenger's original account; Goward (1999) 90 compares how in *Antigone* Eurydice appears at 1183 after the Messenger reports Haemon's death. The consequent repetition emphasises the danger of the moment and gives a crescendo effect; the oracle is now communicated to a more significant recipient, who reacts in a more emotional manner (cf. Panzera (2005) 154–5). This arrangement is also structurally superior: 'had Tecmessa been present from the beginning, her reaction to the news would have had to follow directly on the end of the rhesis, giving the scene a finale abrupt and therefore less effectively climactic' (M. Heath (1987) 192). The form of the exchange, an extended passage of stichomythia where one character has two lines for every one of the other, ensures that 'the pace of the recapitulation is quicker, its emotional tension greater' (*ibid.* p. 191); it is paralleled only by [Aesch.] *PV* 40–81, where, as here, 'the character speaking the single lines is under greater emotional stress' (Griffith (1977) 136).

784–5 ὦ δαῖτα Τέκμησσα, δυσμόρων γένος, | ὅρα μολοῦσα τόνδ' ὅποι' ἔπηθορεῖ. 'Wretched Tecmessa, offspring of unhappy parents, come here and see what this man is saying.' The semantics of δαῖτα 'wretched, unhappy' are unclear: suggestions include 'perhaps from meaning "hostile," it comes to mean "treated as an enemy," and so "cruelly afflicted" by the gods' (Campbell) and 'pass<ive>, "afflicted" (δαίω, to burn), as in Aesch. *Pers.* <281>, etc.' (Jebb; but for the *Persae* passage see West (1990) 81, while 'etc.' is unhelpful). For the vocalism δα– see 364–6n.

γένος used of a single individual prompted the conjectures τέκος (Dawe¹, comparing for the corruption Aesch. *Sept.* 807 τόκος M, γένος M¹; cf. 1303) and λέχος (Housman (1892) 33 = (1972) I 215, comparing for the corruption Eur. *Or.* 1154; cf. *Or.* 1080 λέκτρον, *IA* 1355 εὐνή, Kaimio (2002) 99); cf. however *Ant.* 1116/17–1117/18 Διὸς βαρυβρεμέτα | γένος and the epic phrases δῖον γένος (Hom. *Il.* 9.538, Hes. *Op.* 299, *Hom. Hym.* 1.3) and θεῖον γένος (Hom. *Il.* 6.180, Hes. *Op.* 159). In those passages a genitive or appropriate adjective (e.g. δῖον γένος = διογενής) expresses the origin of the γένος. Transmitted δύσμορον cannot perform such a function, and so, rather than accept the unparalleled and implausible usage of bare γένος meaning simply 'person', with no reference to descent, we should welcome the slight change δυσμόρων

(thus Paehler¹, *testibus* Ll-J/W; *prob.* Pearson (1923) 25–6). This text yields an elegant and original variation on expressions like *Phil.* 874 εὐγενής... ἡ φύσις κάξ εὐγενῶν, *OR* 1397 κακός τ' ὦν κακ κακῶν (thus Ll-J/W, *So.*). The chorus and audience know that Tecmessa's parents were indeed δύσμοροι (487–9, 515–17).

ὄρα is used by a mild synaesthesia (Pind. *P.* 11.30n.) for 'hear', as at *OR* 505/6 πρὶν ἰδοίμ' ὀρθὸν ἔπος, but it also contains a nuance of caution and warning (cf. 1313, Ellendt 538 col. ii).

786 ξυρεῖ γὰρ ἐν χρῶ τοῦτο μὴ χαίρειν τινά. 'The razor's edge cuts close to misery for some' (Lloyd-Jones); literally 'This shaves close to the skin with the result that someone will not rejoice.' The 'razor's edge' metaphor is found in poetry and prose from Homer on to denote a moment of critical importance. Usually a man or his fortune is said to be upon the razor, and thus 'balanced on the thinnest of divisions between contrary fates' (Gow on Theocr. 22.6): cf. Hom. *Il.* [10.173] νῦν γὰρ δὴ πάντεσσιν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἵσταται ἀκμῆς, Theogn. 557 ὁ κληῖρός [West: κίνδυνός codd.] τοι ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἵσταται ἀκμῆς, Hdt. 6.11.2 ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πρήγματα, Aesch. fr. 99.22 *TrGF* (*coni.*; on *Cho.* 883, another possible case, see Garvie), S. *Ant.* 996 φρόνει βεβῶς αὖ νῦν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ τύχης, Eur. *Her.* 630 ὦδ' ἔβητ' ἐπὶ ξυροῦ, [Simon.] *A.P.* 7.250.1 = 724 *FGE*, and also (simply ἐπ' ἀκμῆς, with ξυροῦ understood) Eur. *Hel.* 896–7, Ar. *Plut.* 256. By expressing it instead in terms of close shaving, S. varies the expected (perhaps clichéd?) expression; the absence of an epic pedigree suggests that his formulation is more homely, less elevated, and thus more suitable for the plain-speaking chorus.

A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 191 claim that (ἀπο)ξυρέω is 'probably ill-attested colloquial vocabulary'. Rather, it is the standard, neutral word for 'shave', which does not appear much in our texts because they do not usually have cause to refer to shaving. For ἐν χρῶ referring to close shaving cf. Pherecr. fr. 35 *PCG*, Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.8 ἐν χρῶ κεκαρμένους, Theophr. *Char.* 10.[14], Diocles of Carystus fr. 182.34 Van der Eijk ἐν χρῶ κουρά, Alpers on Oros fr. 861. The phrase also denotes closeness in quite different contexts: cf. fr. 314.97 *TrGF* ὑποσμος ἐν χρῶ. (Silenus, encouraging the satyrs to follow the scent of Apollo's missing cattle), Thuc. 2.84.1 ἐν χρῶ αἰεὶ παραπλέοντες. The dative χρῶ only occurs in this set phrase. Elsewhere (all trimeters) S. has χρωτί (*Ant.* 246, *Tr.* 767) and χροῖ (*Tr.* 605; χροός at fr. 500 *TrGF*); cf. K–B 1 511, Meissner (2006) 137–8 with n. 27.

Indefinite τινά (formally generic, as μὴ indicates) includes Ajax, Tecmessa, the chorus, and anyone who will be grieved by the Messenger's report.

787–8 Enter Tecmessa from the skene, with attendants, but without Eurysaces (so correctly Dain, M. Heath (1987) 191 n. 54, H/OK (2007) 370–1). It would be awkward for him to be returned to the hut at the end of the scene, immediately

before the change of scene occurs and Ajax strides out of the skene, now representing a grove. The vocative at 809 does not prove his presence, since absent characters can be addressed, as Eurysaces is at 340 and 944 (thus Heath; cf. Mastronarde (1979) 104 n. 28).

τί μ' αὖτάλιναν, ἀρτίως πεπαυμένην | κακῶν ἀτρυτῶν, ἐξ ἔδρας ἀνίστατε; 'Why do you once again rouse me from my seat, wretch that I am, when I have recently found respite from unending troubles?' Cf. Eur. fr. 342 *TrGF* τί μ', ὦ γεραῖε, πημάτων λελησμένην | ὀρθοῖς; and 449.5 with Kannicht (adding *Alc.* 938). But ἀτρυτῶν gives the lie to πεπαυμένην: Tecmessa's troubles will not end so easily. According to Mastronarde (1979) 28–9, Tecmessa's reply indicates that she has heard the summons, but not its details. But her response is consistent with her hearing all the chorus's words; she wants to know what news the Messenger is bringing.

ἄτρυτος is attested elsewhere in classical Greek at Pind. *P.* 4.178 ἄτρυτον πόνον, Bacchyl. 5.27, 9.80, Aesch. *Eum.* 403 ἄτρυτον πόδα, Hdt. 9.52 πόνον ἄτρυτον; see further Magnelli on Alex. Aet. fr. 1.5. Athena's epithet Ἀτρυτώνη (*Il.* 2.157, Hes. *Th.* 925, etc.) is probably etymologically distinct (see Gerhard (1978)), but the *Eumenides* passage (from a description of Athena) suggests that Aeschylus and his audience probably connected them.

789–90 τοῦδ' εἰσάκουε τάνδρος, ὥς ἦκει φέρων | Αἴαντος ἡμῖν πρᾶξιν ἦν ἡλγησ' ἐγώ. 'Listen to this man, since he has come bringing news about the condition of Ajax, at which I feel pain.' In place of πρᾶξιν Reiske (1753) 6 conjectures βάξιν ('bring a report about Ajax'; cf. 998). But (i) for singular πρᾶξις meaning 'fortune, condition' Jebb on *OC* 560–1 compares *Tr.* 152, 293–4 ἀνδρὸς εὐτυχῇ | κλύουσα πρᾶξιν τήνδε, [Aesch.] *PV* 695, Hdt. 3.65–7, and (for the plural) *Ant.* 1304–5 σοὶ κακὰς | πράξεις ἐφθυμήσασα. (ii) The compressed utterance φέρων πρᾶξιν meaning φέρων λόγους περὶ πράξεως is paralleled by Aesch. *Pers.* 248 φέρει σαφές τι πρᾶγος ἐσθλὸν ἢ κακὸν κλυεῖν, *Ag.* 638–9, S. *Ant.* 1172 τί δ' αὖ τόδ' ἄχθος βασιλέων ἦκεις φέρων; (iii) The repetition of πρᾶξιν in 792, while consistent with the hypothesis of corruption, is not sufficient to make it probable, since repetition is often freer in classical texts than in modern ones (*El.* 335–6n.).

ἄλγέω takes the accusative of the pain suffered, as at Aesch. *Cho.* 1016 (where see Garvie), Eur. fr. 43 *TrGF*, K–G 1 298; also 136n. For the instantaneous aorist see 99n.

791 οἶμοι, τί φῆς, ἄνθρωπε; μῶν δλώλαμεν; 'Oimoi, what are you saying, man? Is this the death of us?' οἶμοι is corrupted in V to ὤμοι; Finglass (2009g) 206 n. 2 discusses the error. For the spelling and accent of φῆς see *El.* 317n. ἄνθρωπε is much more strongly attested than ὠνθρωπε; the reverse is true at 1154. ὦ is unlikely to affect the tone, and we should print the better supported form in each case. The same corruption is found, in one direction or other,

at Ar. *Ach.* 818, 1107, 1108, *Nub.* 412 (where ὦ earlier guarantees ἄνθ–), *Plut.* 366, Hdt. 1.35.3. This vocative (examples from tragedy, comedy, and prose at Collard (2005a) 369) is a neutral, ‘ordinary and casual’ (Halliwell (1995) 102) way of addressing someone unknown to the speaker (cf. Dickey (1996) 150–4; cf. 1152–5n.). According to Fraenkel (1977) 27–8 (cf. Wackernagel (1912) 24 = (1953–79) II 991), the address is coarse and colloquial; he contrasts the politer address ὦ ξένε which an anonymous tragic messenger usually merits at e.g. *OR* 931, *El.* 671. But foreign messengers are naturally addressed ξένε; here speaker and addressee belong to the same army.

‘I ask “μῶν X” when I am reluctant to accept X as true . . . I think X possible or even probable, and my reluctance is due to apprehension . . . or to surprise, at the possibility’ (Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 794; cf. 1158 and *El.* 446n., on ἄρα μή).

792–3 οὐκ οἶδα τήν σήν πρᾶξι, Αἴαντος δ’ ὅτι, | θυραῖος εἶπερ ἐστίν, οὐ θαρσῶ περί. ‘I don’t know about your position, but as for Ajax, I do know that if he is out of doors, I am not confident for him.’ The Messenger keeps to his brief: not for him to speculate on the consequences of Ajax’s fate for his dependants. Cf. *Phil.* 622–6, where Philoctetes’ angry and tendentious reaction to the False Merchant’s story meets the noncommittal οὐκ οἶδ’ ἐγὼ ταῦτα. Syntactically prominent Αἴαντος, widely separated from its governing preposition περί in anastrophe (parallels in Finglass (2009f) 341), emphasises the Messenger’s preferred topic. τήν σήν πρᾶξι stands for ‘πῶς σὺ πράττεις, i.e. whether you can reasonably say ὀλωλα’ (MLW).

Ll-J/W (*So.*) argue that these lines are addressed not to Tecmessa, but to the chorus, and that οὐκ οἶδα τήν σήν πρᾶξι refers to the latter’s use of the same noun and means ‘I do not know what you mean by πρᾶξις’. (They compare *El.* 1110 οὐκ οἶδα τήν σήν κληδόν’, where see n.) But (i) word order indicates that Αἴαντος marks a new idea opposed to the one in the preceding clause; with Ll-J/W’s interpretation, we get ‘I don’t know about the news you mention [i.e. about Ajax], but as for Ajax . . .’ (ii) The Messenger can hardly declare that he ‘does not know’ about the news which he himself has only just communicated. (iii) After a direct question from Tecmessa, the audience will expect, in the absence of other indications, that the Messenger’s words are directed at Tecmessa. Under Ll-J/W’s interpretation, the Messenger ignores Tecmessa, for no apparent reason, and just happens to express himself in terms which make an acceptable answer to her.

794 καὶ μὴν θυραῖος, ὥστε μ’ ὠδίνειν τί φῆς. ‘Indeed he is outdoors, which causes me anguish at what you say.’ καὶ μὴν ‘with an echoed word, in substantiating a required condition’ (Denniston 353) is superior to the variant καὶ νῦν. Elmsley (*teste* Lobeck²) could be right to add γ’ after θυραῖος; that particle often drops out, not least after καὶ μὴν (531n.). For ὠδίνω (originally of birth pains) of specifically mental pain or grief in tragedy (used of men and women)

Collard (2006) 55 cites Aesch. *Suppl.* 770, Eur. *Hcll.* 644, *Hipp.* 258, *IA* 1234. For the vocalism and accent of φής see 791n.

795–6 ἐκέινον εἶργειν Τεῦκρος ἐξεφίεται | σκηνῆς ὕπαυλον μηδ' ἀφιέναι μόνον. 'Teucer gives strict instructions that he should be kept under the shelter of the hut, and not let out on his own.' For εἶργειν see 752–5n. Blaydes¹ restores the aspiration, now found in C. σκηνῆς ὕπαυλον is equivalent to σκηνῆς ὑπ' αὐλῇ (L. Parker on Eur. *Alc.* 90–2, where μετακύμιος ἄτης means 'amid the waves of disaster'); cf. *El.* 1386 δωμάτων ὑπόστεγοι 'under the roof of the palace', Aesch. *Eum.* 669 τόνδ' ἔπεμψα σῶν δόμων ἐφέστιον. The prefix of ἐξεφίεται intensifies an already powerful verb (112–13n.). For μόνος predicated of Ajax cf. 29–31n. Housman (1892) 34 = (1972) I 215–16 replaces ἀφιέναι μόνον with ἔδν ἀφειμένον, comparing 754, *Ant.* 579, Eur. *El.* [379]; but the paradox is satisfactory, and the supposed corruption complicated.

797 ποῦ δ' ἔστι Τεῦκρος, κάπὶ τῷ λέγει τάδε; 'Where is Teucer, and why does he say this?'

798–9 πάρεστ' ἐκέινος ἄρτι· τήνδε δ' ἐξοδον | ὀλεθρον εἰς Αἴαντος ἐλπίζει φέρειν. 'He has just arrived. As for this departure, he anticipates that it tends to the destruction of Ajax.' ὀλεθρον εἰς for transmitted ὀλεθρίαν is owed to Blaydes¹. For εἰς after its noun and before a genitive qualifying that noun cf. *El.* 14 τοσόνδ' ἔς ἧβης, *OC* 126–7 ἀστιβὲς ἄλσος ἔς | τᾶνδ' ἀμαιμακετᾶν κορᾶν, Eur. *Phoen.* 24, Hom. *Od.* 16.407 δόμον εἰς Ὀδυσῆος, and (for other prepositions) Jebb on *OR* 178, Bruhn §162, Willink on Eur. *Or.* 94. The crucial objection against manuscript ὀλεθρίαν... φέρειν is that it cannot be a conflation of ὀλεθρίαν εἶναι and εἰς ὀλεθρον φέρειν. Blaydes's conjecture restores sense and is palaeographically plausible (cf. J. Jackson (1955) 32): ΙΑΝ in ΑΙΑΝΤΟΣ was anticipated and displaced the correct text. φέρω εἰς 'tend towards' is idiomatic (cf. *OR* 517 ἔς βλάβην φέρον, 519–20 εἰς ἀπλοῦν | ... φέρει, 991 ἔς φόβον φέρον, Eur. *Suppl.* 295, Hdt. 1.10.3, Bruhn §247.26, LSJ⁹ s.v. φέρω A vii 3a); this tells against changing φέρειν to e.g. πέλειν (Blaydes¹), κυρεῖν (Enger (1860) 100), θροεῖ (Blaydes¹, with ἐλπίζειν), or φρενί (Dawe (1968) 11–12 and *STS* I 151–2, φρεσίν *iam* Bergk, p. liv); the noun would be otiose here, as it is not at 585.

Αἴαντος εἰς ὀλεθρον (Blaydes¹) is another possibility, supposing dislocation as well as corruption. Ll-J/W print <τήν> ὀλεθρίαν κτλ., with which they understand ψήφον (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 198 ψήφος κατ' αὐτῶν ὀλεθρία βουλευέσεται); in *So.* they compare for the ellipse Ar. *Ran.* 685 κᾶν ἴσαι γένωνται and Lucian 29.18 πᾶσαις... κρατεῖ. Yet as Kopff (1993) 156 objects, 'there is nothing in the context to suggest voting'. Ll-J/W's reply (in *ST*) that 'voting was such a familiar feature of Athenian life... that the meaning would surely have been clear enough' misses the point that something may be familiar in general and yet unexpected in a given context. Moreover, the two examples which

they cite hardly show that ψῆφος can always be omitted when qualified by an adjective; while an ἔξοδος with voting rights is an excessive metaphor for the plain, direct language of this exchange.

800 οἶμοι τάλαινα, τοῦ ποτ' ἀνθρώπων μαθών; 'Alas, wretched me; who ever did he learn this from?'

801–2 τοῦ Θεστορείου μάντεως, καθ' ἡμέραν | †τὴν νῦν ὅτ' αὐτῷ θάνατον ἢ βίον φέρει. 'From the seer, the son of Thestor, on [this] day, [which] brings him death or life.' I translate Dawe's τήνδ' ἥτις (*STS* 1 152–3), on which see below. Calchas is Θεστορίδης at Hom. *Il.* 1.69, in a context which stresses his unique prophetic power (οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ' ἄριστος), and which may be recalled here, since the word is not found elsewhere in archaic or classical Greek. The adjectival form replacing the possessive genitive adds to the solemnity (41n.).

Manuscripts offer ὅτ' αὐτῷ and ἥτ' αὐτῷ. With the former, φέρει has no subject (certainly not ἔξοδον in 798). The latter, which is unmetrical, is probably a 'correction' of the former into the case of the immediately preceding noun, as if the word were a relative; cf. the gloss ἥτις in some manuscripts (Dawe, *STS* 11 29), which also appears in Xr on ὅ at *OR* 542 in a similar situation. It thus provides at most limited support for τήνδ' ἥτις (Dawe (1968) 12) or τήνδ' ἥπερ (Kousis (1891) 207), although glosses can preserve the truth (146n.), and these conjectures nevertheless seem the most promising possibilities in sense. Ll-J/W print Hermann's conjecture ὁ τοῦτω (*ap.* Lobbeck¹), which they translate '(something) that brings life or death for him today' (*So.*); their text preserves the attractive phrase καθ' ἡμέραν τὴν νῦν, for which cf. Men. *Asp.* 1–2 ἡμέραν . . . | . . . τὴν [νῦν, fr. 630.1 *PCG* ἡ νῦν ἡμέρα, Ar. *Pax* 435. But the absence of an antecedent and the late position of the relative make this difficult. Above all, the *day*, not the message, decides Ajax's fate (Dawe, *STS* 1 152, compares *OR* 438 ἥδ' ἡμέρα φύσει σε καὶ διαφθερεῖ).

803–14 Despite her grief, Tecmessa takes the initiative and urges the chorus to divide for the hunt. The format recurs in the satyr-play *Ichneutae*, where after a speech from Silenus ordering a search, the chorus split into three groups which separately approach the entrances to the cave (fr. 314.91–123 *TrGF*). The departure of a chorus mid-way through a play is paralleled for tragedy only in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, Euripides' *Alcestis* (though see L. Parker on 746), *Helen*, and the anonymous *Rhesus* (Taplin (1977) 375–6). The division of the chorus into discrete units occurs in Eur. *Or.* 1258–60 (cited 866–78n.), where the chorus split in two to guard the entrance of each *eisodos*; cf. also Eur. *Her.* 240–2 ἄγ', οἱ μὲν Ἑλικῶν, οἱ δὲ Παρνασοῦ πτυχάς | τέμνειν ἄνωχ' ἐλθόντες ὕλουργούς δρυὸς | κορμούς, where Lycus sends attendants off via different *eisodoi*.

803 οἱ γὰρ φίλοι ‘Alas, my friends’: the exclamation marks Tecmessa’s realisation of the truth (737n.) and intense grief (*El.* 674n.).

πρόστητ’ ἀναγκαίᾳς τύχης ‘make a stand against fatal fortune’. Tecmessa’s concern is for Ajax: she asks the chorus to find him, in order to forestall the τύχη ἀναγκαία which could result in his death. But her previous confidence in the supreme power of this very force (485–6n.) calls into doubt her attempt to frustrate it.

πρόστην with the genitive means ‘stand before’, here with the nuance of interposition before an approaching threat; cf. *Hdt.* 9.107.2 οἱ δορυφόροι οἱ Μασιστέω πρόστησαν (‘interposed themselves’). Other meanings under this heading include ‘defend’ (*Eur. Hcl.* 306 Ἑλληνίδος γῆς . . . προύστησαν) and ‘support, champion’ (*El.* 979–80, Aeschin. 2.161).

804–6 καὶ σπεύσασθ’ οἱ μὲν Τεῦκρον ἐν τάχει μολεῖν, | οἱ δ’ ἐσπέρους ἀγκῶνας, οἱ δ’ ἀντηλίους | ζητεῖτ’ ἰόντες τάνδρὸς ἔξοδον κακὴν. ‘And some make haste to have Teucer come with speed, while some go to the glens of the west, others to those of the east, and investigate the man’s ill-fated departure.’ For the division of the chorus see 803–14n.; for the stage action see 814n. ἀντήλιος means ‘facing the (rising) sun’ (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 519); this, and not the variant ἀνθ-, is the tragic form (see Lobeck’s n.). Most manuscripts have ἀνδρός rather than τάνδρὸς, but the article is essential; for crasis corruptions see 39n.

807–8 ἔγνωκα γὰρ δὴ φῶτός ἡπατημένη | καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς χάριτος ἐκβεβλημένη. ‘For I recognise that I have been cheated of the man, and cast out of the favour in which I used to be held.’ Tecmessa assumes that Ajax has left the hut intent on suicide. This is not a necessary inference from the Messenger’s report, but his earlier conduct makes her assumption reasonable. Her remarks are especially poignant after 522–4: the rejection of her appeal to χάρις is now clear. Brief enough not to delay the search, her words show that she understands the broader picture of deception despite the extreme urgency.

ἔγνωκα marks recognition of a previous misapprehension, as at *Ant.* 1095. ἡπατημένη takes a genitive of separation on the analogy of ψεύδομαι (*Bruhn* §23.1, *Moorhouse* 75), not a (rarer) genitive of agent (330n.). For the concluding rhyme ἡπατημένη . . . ἐκβεβλημένη cf. 1085–6, *Wilkins* on *Eur. Hcl.* 541–2, *Denniston* (1952) 10–11.

809–10 οἶμοι, τί δράσω, τέκνον; οὐχ ἰδρυτέον. | ἀλλ’ εἶμι κἀγὼ κεῖσ’ ὅποῖπερ ἂν σθένω. ‘Oimoi, what am I to do, my child? I must not remain. No, I too will go wherever I have the strength.’ The last phrase (for which cf. *Ar. Plut.* 912 καθ’ ὅσον ἂν σθένω) prepares for her dramatically necessary isolation from the chorus in the next scene. MD contrasts 690: Ajax, unlike his would-be rescuers, knows exactly where he is going.

811 χωρώμεν, ἔγκονῶμεν, οὐχ ἔδρας ἀκμή. ‘Let’s go, let’s hurry, it’s no time for sitting.’ The asyndeton (cf. 988, 1414, *Tr.* 1255 ἀγ’ ἐγκονεῖτ’, αἶρεσθε, *Ar. Plut.* 255 ἴτ’, ἐγκονεῖτε, σπεύδεθ’, *Eur. Hec.* 507 σπεύδωμεν, ἐγκονῶμεν, *Or.* 1258 χωρεῖτ’, ἐπειγώμεσθα, *Aesch. Sept.* 60, Kaimio (1970) 146 n. 1; also 59–60n.) and verbless final phrase (cf. *Eur. Or.* 1291 οὐχ ἔδρας ἀγών, *Bacchyl.* fr. 15.1 S–M οὐχ ἔδρας ἔργον οὐδ’ ἀμβολᾶς; also *Hom. Il.* 23.205 οὐχ ἔδος) signal haste. The echo of 787–8 underlines the sudden change of situation.

[812 σῶζειν θέλοντες ἄνδρα γ’ ὅς σπεύδῃ θανεῖν.] ‘as we desire to save a man who hastens to his death.’ Dindorf (1836) v deletes the line, the language and sense of which are problematic. γ’ is metrically guaranteed but obscure; θέλοντες is a curious hanging nominative, hardly if at all improved by reading θέλοντας (*L., coni. Hermann*), θέλουσιν (*Wunder*²), or θέλοντος (*Dresdensis Da.* 22); while the generic subjunctive (see below) is inappropriate with a specific referent. Fraenkel (1977) 28 notes that 813 makes for a better connexion with 811 than 812 (cf. χωρώμεν ~ χωρεῖν ἔτοιμος).

Manuscripts are split between ὅς and ὅς ἄν, and between σπεύδῃ and σπεύδει. According to the most plausible reconstruction of the corruption, original ὅς σπεύδῃ acquired ἄν in some manuscripts, and had its subjunctive changed to the indicative in others, since the generalising subjunctive without ἄν frequently causes scribal confusion (758–61n.; thus Dawe, *STS* 1 153–4).

A^{ac} does not contain this line or the two which follow; the writer of the scholia adds them. According to Haslam (1979) 98, the absence of 812 ‘may be due not to omission but to sincere tradition’; the former is more likely, since there is no other reason to doubt 813–14.

813 χωρεῖν ἔτοιμος, κοῦ λόγῳ δείξω μόνον. ‘I’m ready to go, and will show this in more than words.’ Ellipse of εἰμί is so common with ἔτοιμος, even when urgency is not at issue (to the examples cited by Mastronarde on *Eur. Phoen.* 968–9 add *Eur. El.* 796, *Her.* 453), that it probably does not mark haste. Dawe, *STS* 1 154, calls the minority variant χωρεῖν γ’ ‘attractive’, but neither restriction nor emphasis seems in place.

814 τάχος γὰρ ἔργου καὶ ποδῶν ἅμ’ ἔψεται. ‘For speed of act and of foot will go in tandem.’

The chorus divide into two and leave via separate eisodoi. The Messenger leaves via eisodos A, Tecmessa via eisodos B with attendants. At 804–6 Tecmessa orders three separate missions, using a plural imperative for each: to seek Teucer (i), Ajax, to the west (ii), and Ajax, to the east (iii). The hemi-choruses who appear at 866 carry out missions (ii) and (iii) (cf. 874, 877–8), and so the chorus presumably divides into two now. Since Tecmessa discovers the body of Ajax at 891, she too will go searching for him. This leaves the Messenger to carry out (i), since he has the best idea of where Teucer is now.

The plural imperative does not mean that more than one person undertook (i): repeated οἱ δ' in the following line could have attracted an originally singular imperative into the plural.

Since the Messenger is returning to Teucer, he leaves via eisodos A to return to the camp. The departure of the chorus is not as clear-cut. Ajax himself had left via eisodos B, and so H/OK (2007) 371 argue that the whole chorus (split into two search parties), together with Tecmessa, exit in that direction, and separate only when out of sight; the two halves return from the same eisodos, a short time apart, at 866. But it is *prima facie* odd, and dramatically unsatisfying, that Tecmessa should place such emphasis on sending search parties east and west, only for the entire expedition to leave (and return) by the same exit. Time has elapsed since Ajax left the stage, and his destination remains unclear. Well aware that she has been deceived (807–8), Tecmessa takes precautions against the possibility that his departure was a feint. She could go with either group; I have preferred to separate her from the Messenger, so the two actors divide, like the chorus. She is accompanied by attendants, later needed to lift the body of Ajax (925/6–936n.).

THIRD EPISODE, PART TWO (815–65)

815–65 A single speech from Ajax takes up a second scene. The sense of isolation is still greater, since Ajax appears on stage alone; Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 1–77 cites parallels, none as extreme. The suicide at the end is strongly closural; yet so too is the change of scene at the beginning, preceded as it is by the departure of the chorus. As a result, 'Ajax's speech is both a prologue to the second part of the play and the conclusion of the first' (Taplin (1977) 384–5).

Ajax takes some pride in his practical preparations for the suicide. The sword, newly whetted (820), stands where it will be sharpest (815), fixed in the ground (819) and supported by the earth heaped round it (821), to provide the easiest kind of death (822): good preparations indeed (823). A man whose world has collapsed, and whose attempt to deal with that collapse ended in such humiliating catastrophe, manages to impose order on this small but most dreadful task. This preamble also expresses Ajax's wider alienation. Hector, whose gift the sword was, is now most hateful to him (817–18), while the very land of Troy is hostile (819). There follows a series of invocations, switching between 2nd and 3rd persons for the sake of variety (cf. Headlam on Herodas 4.1): to Zeus, Hermes, the Erinyes, and the Sun. The first two deal with the act itself and its aftermath; the very first is prescient, as Ajax's enemies will indeed attempt to mistreat him after death. The third widens the focus to Ajax's enemies, the Atreidae and the Greek army, whom Ajax had tried to kill with this same weapon only a few hours ago; he attributes responsibility for

his death to the former, and demands the destruction of the latter. This is far from the conciliatory words in his previous speech. The focus now widens again, as Ajax asks the Sun to announce his death to his parents; he gives his dependants some thought in his final moments.

Again expressing his need for haste (852–3; cf. 816), Ajax moves to his final words, a series of much briefer invocations: of light, Salamis, Athens and its people, and the springs, rivers, and plains of Troy which have nourished him. Apart from the Athenian γένος, all these are places rather than people; his isolation remains until the end. But his closing address χάρετ', ὦ τροφῆς ἐμοί (863) does at least allow him a concluding note of gratitude. However alienated he is from his fellow men, a kind of χάρις has existed in Ajax's world. His final two lines, explicitly bringing his speech with the living to a close, are an appropriate end to a speech which is as significant for what it does not say as for what it does. There is no attempt to explain the difference in Ajax's attitude from his previous speech. The audience probably realised the deception at the time, and Tecmessa has only just come to the same conclusion (807–8); for Ajax to explain his deception would merely detract from the grandeur of his final moments. The tone is surprising, given Ajax's previous complaints: there is 'no lament, reproach, world-weariness, aversion, no hint of melancholy' (Reinhardt (1947) 36 = (1979) 28; contrast Tr. Adesp. fr. 110 *TrGF*, from a suicide speech by another author's Ajax, where the character bitterly laments his ἀτιμία). His continuing antipathy is all concentrated in the terrible curse. In his successive invocations Ajax ignores Athena, author of his downfall. There is no word for Tecmessa, Eurysaces, or his soldiers; he mentions Teucer merely as the discoverer of his corpse. Focussed and precise, Ajax expresses a tightly arranged series of requests. He does not descend into self-pity, nor relinquish his anger, nor give more than cursory consideration to the fate of his family. Of all his speeches, this is the most terrible and the most dignified; the audience will not hear its like again.

Ajax enters from the skene, no longer covered in blood. As he does so, the audience understands that the scene has shifted to the unidentified place in the wilderness designated earlier as his destination (657–9). Since Ajax begins by describing how he has fixed his sword in the earth, and yet the sword is not visible, the audience will assume that it is meant to be in position behind the skene, which thus could represent trees or bushes such as could be found in a place untouched by human habitation (657 ὄστιβῆ). This impression of the skene is confirmed at 892, when it is referred to as a νόστος. A bloody dummy, pierced through by a sword, is already in position out of sight behind the skene: discovered by Tecmessa at 891, it is brought on stage by Tecmessa's attendants during the ensuing lyric (925/6–936n.). Ajax's death within the skene is supported by P. Arnott (1962) 131–2, Gardiner (1979) 12–13, M. Heath

(1987) 192–3, Macintosh (1994) 130–1, and countenanced by Taplin (1978) 189 n. 5.

Other accounts of the portrayal of Ajax's suicide are as follows:

(i) *Ajax kills himself in full view of the audience* (thus Σ p. 185, Brunck, K. Müller (1838) 1099–1102 = (1847–8) 1306, Enger (1853b) 216–17). The scholia speculate on S.'s motive for avoiding the usual practice of having the death announced by a messenger, as in Aeschylus' *Threissai*: ἴσως οὖν καινοτομεῖν βουλόμενος καὶ μὴ κατακολουθεῖν τοῖς ἑτέροις ὅπ' ὄψιν ἔθηκε τὸ δρώμενον ἢ μᾶλλον ἐκπληῖσαι βουλόμενος. Scullion (1994) 96–107 demolishes this theory:

(a) There is no precedent for a violent death, or even severe wound, being inflicted on the fifth-century tragic (or even comic) stage (Scullion 96–7, Sommerstein (2004) 44–55 = (2010a) 33–45). Aside from the problems in positing a singularity, the technology to effect it was presumably unavailable. Later theatrical practice knew weapons with retractable blades (cf. Polemon fr. 95 *FHG* = III 146–7, *ap.* Hesych. σ 2799 = p. 389 Hansen, s.v. συσπαστόν and Hesych. α 4765 = I 165 Latte, s.v. ἀνδρομητόν, Ach. Tat. 3.20.7, 21.4), but since classical drama has no need for them, producers would not have had them to hand.

(b) Ajax's body would be instantly visible to the chorus when they enter at 866. Yet they are unaware of him until Tecmessa breaks the news of his death at 898–9, and as late as 914 have not seen him (Scullion 98–9, Sommerstein (2004) 45 = (2010a) 34).

(c) The actor would need to be replaced by a dummy at some point between 865 and 974, and there is no convincing explanation of how this could have been effected (Scullion 99–101). Keeping the actor on stage until the end of the play, and consequently using a fourth actor, is not an option (*ibid.* 90–1 with n. 5); nor is a visible substitution (101–3).

K. Müller (1838) 1102–3 = (1847–8) 1306 takes Tecmessa's covering of the body at or shortly after 915–16 as an opportunity for the switch. But an actor would find it difficult to block the view of the entire theatre (Scullion 99–100), or hold his arms up long enough for the substitution to take place (M. Heath (1987) 199 n. 70). Garvie argues (p. 203) that stagehands bring on a screen at 915–16, behind which the substitution takes place. But scene-shifters are doubtful for any classical tragedy (Introduction p. 13), and even scholars who accept their involvement during the change of scene at 814 would probably balk at their presence during the action. Nor is it clear how the screen is removed to allow Teucer to see the body.

(d) The detailed description of the placing of the sword at 815–23 suggests that the audience cannot see it: 'his retrospective description of the action seems much more natural as a substitute for the unseen than as a retailing of the seen' (Scullion 105; thus Camerer (1953) 321 n. 62, M. Heath (1987) 192–3). Furthermore, if Ajax enters with his sword, he would have to place it in the

ground before he begins to speak (815 ἔστηκεν, 819 πέπηγε, 821 ἔπηξα). This would be no simple procedure: Ajax emphasises the dexterity of his positioning (815–16, 821). It would be odd for his meticulous activity to be followed by a lengthy verbal description of what the audience had just seen. Exekias' depiction of Ajax heaping up the earth to plant the sword (Introduction pp. 29–30) focusses on a single moment before the suicide, without such a risk of tedium. Deictic pronouns at 828, 834, or 907 do not imply a visible sword (Pickard-Cambridge (1946) 126), any more than Eur. *Ba.* 591–2 εἶδετε λάιννα κίοσιν ἔμβολα | τόδε διάδρομα; implies visible collapsing stone lintels, *Hel.* 1 Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί a visible depiction of the Nile, or *Hec.* 823 καπνὸν δὲ πόλεως τόνδ' ὑπερθρόσκονθ' ὀρώ visible smoke (cf. 77n. on absent persons denoted by deictic pronouns).

(ii) *Ajax kills himself on stage, but unseen by the audience.* According to Jebb, 'the underwood . . . screens [Ajax] when he falls'. He does not specify whether this underwood was brought on after 814 by scene-shifters or was present from the start of the play. But 'the steep rise of the auditorium in the theatre of Dionysus would have enabled a considerable portion of the audience to look over anything resembling a bush and see both the actor's fall and the substitution of a dummy for the actor' (Gardiner (1979) 12; cf. Scullion 107). Noting the latter point, but still accepting Jebb's reconstruction, Stanford suggests that 'the audience . . . would probably be satisfied with a symbolical concealment'. Since he rejects the use of a retractable sword, this means that some of the audience would see Ajax throw himself to the ground and miss the weapon. O most lame and impotent conclusion!

(iii) *Ajax kills himself on the ekkyklema.* Lobeck¹ (in his text, on 814) first associates the ekkyklema with the death scene; taking this up, Klausen (1834) 328 has Ajax enter on the ekkyklema decorated as a grove and kill himself on a sword concealed by a shrubbery at the front of the platform. Tecmessa discovers the body after entering from the skene; the actor is then replaced by a dummy from within that building. (Similarly Reinhardt (1947) 37–8, 248–9 n. 1 ≈ (1979) 29, 238–9 n. 17, Webster (1970) 17–18, Ley (1988) 92, Rehm (2002) 131; Webster and Ley put the dummy on the ekkyklema from the beginning.) Bethe (1896) 128–9 also has Ajax enter on a decorated ekkyklema, with his sword fixed in front of him; but it is withdrawn, just before he kills himself. Tecmessa discovers him behind the skene, after which the ekkyklema reappears with her and the dummy (*prob.* Wiles (1997) 163–5, (2007) 254, Meineck (2006) 455).

But the ekkyklema is only used to reveal the interior of some kind of dwelling (thus K. Müller (1838) 1100 = (1847–8) 1 304). Scullion 108 cites Ar. *Au.* 92 ἀνοιγε τήν ὕλην, ἵν' ἐξέλθω ποτέ, where the Hoopoe is 'rolled out in his 100% natural dwelling'; as he says, this comic variation on the tragic technique is the exception which proves the rule. In tragedy a grove could not be treated as if it were a house. Meineck's claim that S. 'has subverted

the *ekkyklema*'s convention of displaying interior scenes in order to depict the most private and intimate act of Ajax' is arbitrary and inaccurate ('private' and 'intimate' hardly suit Ajax's repeated invocations of divine powers to act on his behalf). Wiles's belief that the entry of the *ekkyklema* signifies the scene-change is also mistaken; elsewhere in tragedy the device is used several times, only once possibly coinciding with a change of scene (Aesch. *Eum.* 235). Klausen's reconstruction involves an additional problem, discussed under (ii): even a prodigious shrubbery could not conceal Ajax's suicide from the audience. The height of the *ekkyklema* would make concealment still more difficult.

The absence of preparation for the appearance of the *ekkyklema* constitutes a final argument against its appearance. Its regular employment to show the inside of a dwelling is signalled verbally in advance (346–7n.); it would be extraordinary for an unprecedented use to occur with no prior warning (cf. M. Heath (1987) 193).

(iv) *Ajax kills himself in a grove at the side of the skene*. Purgold (1802) 42–3, 45 favours this arrangement. Following Purgold, Scullion (1994) 93 claims that the grove offers 'concealed access to the backstage area'. According to Purgold, the appearance of Ajax from the grove represents a change of scene away from Ajax's hut; according to Scullion, there is no scene change. I explain my rejection of both these reconstructions in the Introduction, pp. 14–19.

Ajax has probably carried out the washing which he mentions at 654–6, for the following reasons. (i) His final speech is full of prayers to the gods, who would hardly answer them if he was still polluted by the blood of the animals. (ii) Since he 'know[s] that the fate of his body is at risk . . . Ajax would be foolish in the extreme if he did not attempt to assuage Athene's anger' by undertaking the washing (H/OK (2007) 372 n. 28). (iii) Ajax's deception speech elsewhere consists of truths and half-truths intended to mislead, but not outright lies, such as 654–6 would become if no washing took place. (iv) A clean Ajax makes for a dramatically satisfying contrast with the bloody, disfigured corpse which will form the centrepiece of the rest of the play. (Contrast the views of Scullion (1994) 120 n. 120, that a bloodstained Ajax would be 'infinitely more effective dramatically and thematically', and Henrichs (2004) 194–5, who claims that Ajax 'never lives up to his ritual promise to rid himself of the pollution and its source', and that 'the announced rites of purification are deferred to a later point in the action': i.e. the end.)

Citing evidence for kneeling in ancient prayers (add Pulleyn (1997) 190), M. I. Davies (1985) 90–4 raises the possibility that Ajax might kneel (cf. p. 90 n. 29 for visual parallels), but the speech would be hard to deliver effectively from that position.

815–18 ὁ μὲν σφαγεὺς ἕστηκεν ἢ τομώτατος | γένοιτ' ἂν, εἴ τῳ καὶ
λογίζεσθαι σχολή, | δῶρον μὲν ἀνδρὸς Ἑκτορος ξένων ἐμοὶ | μάλιστα

μισηθέντος, ἐχθίστου θ' ὄρᾱν. 'The slaughterman stands where it will be sharpest – if a man has leisure to make calculations – the gift of Hector, the man most hateful of foreigners to me, and most detestable to see.' In Homer, the exchange of gifts with Hector (661–3n.) signals the cessation of fighting and the warriors' mutual respect. 'By the addition of ξένων he reserves his chief hatred for the Argives' (Campbell); Kane (1996) refutes Jebb's influential attempt to see a reference to guest-friendship. The weapon as it were retains the hostility of its previous owner; Hirzel (1910) 416 compares Dido's suicide with a sword given her by Aeneas (Virg. *Aen.* 4.646–7).

σφαγεύς is sacrificial terminology (cf. Eur. *IT* 621–3, *Her.* 451, *Andr.* 1134, Casabona (1966) 178–9; first attested in Mycenaean, PY Qa 1308]pā-ke-u, probably referring to the priest: Weilhartner (2005) 137), continuing the 'perverted sacrifice' theme (218–19n.). Ajax is no longer the sacrificer, but the object of sacrifice. His contempt for mere deliberation (λογίζεσθαι) and idleness (συχολή) suits a man of action (cf. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 43–4). ἀνδρός goes with μισηθέντος and is in apposition to Ἔκτορος (cf. Bruhn §13, comparing Hom. *Il.* 5.649). Manuscripts with punctuation put it after Ἔκτορος, and many editors take ἀνδρός directly with Ἔκτορος, but good parallels for bare ἀνὴρ directly qualifying a proper name are lacking (*El.* 45n.).

West (1978a) 113 replaces Ἔκτορος with δυσμενοῦς; the paradoxos, he argues, arose from the intrusion of a proper name as a gloss (28n.). But the adjective is weak before the superlatives. The deletions of 816 by anonymous scholars in the scholia (Σ^H = p. 187 Chr. ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τοῦτό τις; someone could have added it to supply a verb to ἦ τομώτατος), and of 816–18 by Herwerden (1862) 112, who believes that the lines were made up on the model of 661–5 (cf. 1024–7), are insufficiently motivated and destroy thematic connexions identified above.

819–20 πέπηγε δ' ἐν γῇ πολέμῳ τῇ Τρωάδι, | σιδηροβρώτι θηγάνῃ νεκρονῆς. 'It stands fixed in the hostile land of the Troad, newly sharpened on an iron-gnawing whetstone.' As at 459, Ajax views the Trojan land as enemy territory (contrast 862–3). The whetstone is a familiar grim image in contexts of killing: cf. *El.* 1394 νεακόνητον αἶμα χειροῖν ἔχων, Aesch. *Sept.* 715, *Ag.* 1535–6, *Eum.* 859 αἰματηρὰς θηγάνας. The sharpening makes the weapon appear more threatening, and indicates Ajax's detailed preparations. Adjectives in –βρώς (cognate with βιβρώσκω, 'eat') are mainly tragic: cf. ὠμοβρώς (fr. 799.5 *TrGF*, Eur. *Tro.* 436, *Her.* 887, Timoth. fr. 791.138 *PMG* = Hordern), ἀνδροβρώς (Eur. *Her.* 385, *Cycl.* 93, fr. 537.1 *TrGF*), τριχοβρώς (Ar. *Ach.* 1111, a word for 'moths' in the mouth of the pompous Lamachus, perhaps paratragic), χειροβρώς (*Suda* χ 249 = iv 802.3 Adler). The Homeric noun βούβρωστις is related (*Il.* 24.532; 'ravens hunger', according to Richardson).

821–2 ἔπηξα δ' αὐτὸν εὖ περιστείλας ἐγώ, | εὐνούστατον τῷδ' ἀνδρὶ διὰ τάχους θανεῖν. 'I planted it, securing it well all round, so that it should prove most kind to this man in providing a speedy death.' For Exekias' depiction of this moment see Introduction pp. 29–30. περί– suggests the piling up of earth around the sword to ensure stability. εὐνούστατον is deliberately paradoxical in the context of killing: 'suicides in literature often treat as friendly the means of self-destruction' (MD, comparing Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* 5.1.85 'cordial and not poison'). διὰ plus genitive 'indicates the route followed . . . and not the end reached' (Moorhouse 103; cf. *El.* [1509]n.).

823 οὕτω μὲν εὐσκευοῦμεν 'Thus I am well prepared.' For the brisk transition formula cf. 831.

823–31 Ajax's request of Zeus is apparently fulfilled (see 998–9); Tecmessa discovers the body, but Teucer raises it from the sword-point (1024–5).

823–4 ἐκ δὲ τῶνδὲ μοι | σὺ πρῶτος, ὦ Ζεῦ, καὶ γὰρ εἰκός, ἄρκεσον. 'After this you, o Zeus, as is fitting, be the first to help me'. Parenthetic καὶ γὰρ εἰκός (parallels at FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 931) explains πρῶτος: the first among the gods, the beginning of human enterprises (cf. Terpander fr. 698 *PMG*, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.12.13), should be first to provide help, and to be invoked (thus Welcker (1845) 351). For other passages when a worshipper explicitly names a god 'first' cf. *OR* 159, Ar. *Nub.* 563–5, West (2007) 306. Welcker's alternative view is that Zeus as Ajax's great-grandfather (387n.) should be first to assist. But there is no mention of his ancestry, and, since πρῶτος adequately explains the phrase, no need to invoke it.

Fraenkel (1931) 4 n. 6 = (1964) I 357 n. 1 claims that καὶ γὰρ εἰκός is a prayer formula (equivalent to δύνασαι γάρ), comparing *El.* 659 (Clytemnestra to Apollo) τοὺς ἐκ Διὸς γὰρ εἰκός ἐστι πάνθ' ὁρᾶν and Ar. *Thesm.* 1143/4 (the chorus to Athena) φάνηθ' ὦ τυράννους στυγοῦσ' ὥσπερ εἰκός. But in these cases, εἰκός refers to a quality of the deity addressed, not to the action requested by the prayer.

825 αἰτήσομαι δέ σ' οὐ μακρὸν γέρας λαβεῖν. 'I shall ask to obtain no great favour from you.' The smaller the request, the easier to grant it: cf. Theogn. 13–14 εὐχομένῳ μοι κλῦθι, κακὰς δ' ἀπὸ κῆρας ἄλαλκε | σοὶ μὲν τοῦτο θεὰ σμικρόν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μέγα, Posid. fr. 104.1 A–B οὐ μέγα σ' αἰτ[ώ], Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.282–4 "*unum – | quid tam magnum?*" addens – "*unum me sup̄ite morti, | dis etenim facile est!*" and contrast Hdt. 1.66.2 (the Pythia to the Spartans) Ἀρκαδίην μ' αἰτεῖς; μέγα μ' αἰτεῖς· οὗ τοι δώσω. Ajax uses the idiom with bitter irony (so Perrotta (1935) 158): denied the real γέρας of the Arms of Achilles, he is reduced to making what seems by contrast a limited request. But in a further, proleptic, irony, securing the burial will prove to be more difficult than he anticipates

(cf. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 44). Future αἰτήσομαι is polite (678–82n.). For μακρόν see 129–30n.

Manuscripts are split between λαβεῖν and λαχεῖν (675–6n.); the former, better attested (cf. Dawe, *STS* 154), and giving preferable sense (simply ‘obtain’ rather than ‘obtain as one’s lot’, for which cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.49 = 24.70), is paralleled by Eur. *Hec.* 40–1 αἰτεῖ... | ... γέρας λαβεῖν. A few manuscripts invert the infinitive with γέρας through *vitium Byzantinum* (302–4n.).

826–8 πέψον τιν’ ἡμῖν ἄγγελον, κακὴν φάτιν | Τεύκρω φέροντα, πρῶτος ὧς με βαστάσῃ | πεπτῶτα τῷδε περὶ νεορράντῳ ξίφει ‘Send a messenger for me, bearing the grim tidings to Teucer, so that he may be the first to raise me as I lie fallen on this freshly-dripping sword.’ The prayer is introduced in asyndeton and expressed in the aorist (*El.* 643n.). βαστάζω ‘lift’ (*El.* 905n., where add L. Parker on Eur. *Alc.* 19–20) is used of raising a corpse at Eur. *Alc.* 724. The alternative ‘handle’ is inferior: raising the corpse was an essential early step in the process of burial (cf. *Ant.* 43 εἰ τὸν νεκρὸν ξὺν τῇδε κουφιῆς χερί; also ἀναιρέομαι in LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀναιρέω B 13).

‘Greek uses ἀμφί or περί where a body falls or is impaled on something sharp, because when a spike is stuck into you, you are round it’ (West on Hes. *Op.* 205–6): cf. 899, 907, Pind. *N.* 8.23 κείνος [i.e. φθόνος] καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἷόν, φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσας, Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 576, Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 1180. For τῷδε of an invisible object see 815–65n.

829–30 καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἔχθρῳν του κατοπτευθεὶς πάρος | ῥιφθῶ κυσὶν πρόβλη-
ητος οἰωνοῖς θ’ ἔλωρ. ‘and I shall not be noticed beforehand by some enemy and thrown out as prey to dogs and birds’. These creatures are the regular beneficiaries of exposed corpses (*El.* 1487–8n., adding FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 800–1, West (1997) 215–16, (2007) 491–2, 476 with n. 87; cf. 1064–5, where birds alone are mentioned). ἔλωρ (principally an epic word) in this context looks back to the earliest of these passages, Hom. *Il.* 1.4–5 αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν | οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι (cf. *Od.* 3.270–1, 5.473, 24.290–2), itself imitated at Aesch. *Suppl.* 800–1 κυσὶν δ’ ἔπειθ’ ἔλωρα κάπιχωρίοις | ὄρνισι δειπνον οὐκ ἀναινομαι πέλειν. Zr’s κυσὶν is metrically preferable to κυσί, which would require a rare lengthening at word boundary before mute and liquid (*El.* 853n.; a lyric example at *Aj.* 1220).

831 τοσαῦτά σ’, ὦ Ζεῦ, προστρέπω ‘Such is my supplication of you, o Zeus.’ The formula is brisk (cf. 823) but not curt. Instead of προστρέπω (cf. προστρόπαιος at 1173), most manuscripts have προτρέπω (‘impel’ or ‘cause to yield’); for the reverse corruption see *El.* 1193n.

831–2 καλῶ δ’ ἄμα | πομπαῖον Ἑρμῆν χθόνιον εὖ με κοιμίσαι ‘At the same time I call on Hermes of the earth below, escort of souls, to lull me fast to sleep.’ Ajax invokes Hermes as *psychopomp*, one part of his chthonic aspect, on which

see *El.* 111n. (adding Nisbet and Hubbard on *Hor. C.* 1.10.17). Hermes usually leads the souls of the dead to Hades, rather than assisting at the moment of death; for the latter function Mikalson (1989) 92 compares *OC* 1544–8. Electra invokes Hermes alongside the Erinyes at *El.* 111–12.

Here and at 835 καλῶ marks a ‘brief but formal summons’ (Dunbar on *Ar. Av.* 849); cf. its use to invoke gods at *Ar. Nub.* 565, *Thesm.* 1136–7, *Lys.* 1280. The common euphemism for death, sleep (*El.* 509n.), is appropriate given Ajax’s subsequent prayer.

833–4 ξὺν ἀσφαδᾶστω καὶ ταχεῖ πηδήματι | πλευρὰν διαρρήξαντα τῷδε φασγάνῳ. ‘as with a swift and spasmless leap I break through my ribs with this sword.’ For a possible visual parallel for the swift leap see Introduction p. 40. Ajax prays to avoid the painful ἀπολακτισμοὶ βίου (Aesch. *Suppl.* 937, where see FJ/W) which can afflict a dying man: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1292–4 (Cassandra) ἐπεύχομαι δὲ καιρίας πλῆγῃς τυχεῖν, | ὥς ἀσφάδαστος, αἱμάτων εὐθνησίμῳς | ἀπορρύντων, ὅμα συμβάλω τόδε, Eur. fr. 1020 *TrGF* ὁ δ’ ἐσφάδαζεν, οὐκ ἔχων ἀπαλλαγός (cited by a scholium on our passage, and thus probably referring to a death agony). Virgil’s Dido requires divine intervention at her suicide for a similar purpose (*Aen.* 4.693–5): *tum Iuno omnipotens longum miserata dolorem | difficilisque obitus Irim demisit Olympo | quae luctantem animam nexosque resolveret artus*. For the leap onto the sword cf. Eur. *Hel.* 96 οἰκείον αὐτὸν ᾧλεσ’ ἄλμ’ ἐπὶ ξίφος. For τῷδε of an invisible object see 815–65n.

ἀσφαδᾶστω (Nauck⁴), not –άστω (codd.), is correct: cf. Herodian II 929.14–15 Lentz, *Lexicon Messanense* 281 recto, lines 2–3 = p. 406 Rabe (citing fr. 349 *TrGF* νεοσφαδᾶστων), *EM* 737.22–35 Gaisford, Usener (1865) 244–5 = (1912–14) II 93–4, Pearson on fr. 848.1, S–D I 265–6. (Editors ascribe the correction to L. Dindorf, but he, in 1865, *ap.* Stephanus (1831–65) VII 1569a, merely lists ancient authorities for the spelling.)

The variant ἀναρρήξαντα (thus Σ^L 833 = p. 190 Chr.; elsewhere in S. at 236, *OR* 1075) might be right: loss of initial ἀν(α)– through haplography after –άν could have led to the insertion of δι(α)– to restore the metre (thus Dawe, *STS* I 154). διαρρήγνυμι is not elsewhere attested in S., but the alternative is found only twice. Both are classical. ἀναρρήξαι is corrupted to ἀπορρήξω at Eur. *El.* 837.

835–7 καλῶ δ’ ἄρωγούς τὰς αἰεὶ τε παρθένους | αἰεὶ θ’ ὀρώσας πάντα τὰν βροτοῖς πάθη, | σεμνὰς Ἑρινύς τανύποδας ‘And I call as my helpers the perpetual virgins, the perpetual overseers of all the sufferings of men, the dread, far-striding Erinyes.’ For καλῶ see 831–2n.; for ἄρωγός of a deity in a cletic prayer cf. *OR* 206/7, Aesch. *Eum.* 289. The Erinyes are often designated κόραι (cf. *OC* 40, 127, Aesch. *Eum.* 69–70 γραῖαι, παλαιαὶ παῖδες, αἷς οὐ μείγνυται | θεῶν τις οὐδ’ ἀνθρώπος οὐδὲ θῆρ ποτε, 792, Eur. *Or.* 256, Servius on Virg. *Aen.* 6.280 = II 49.3 Thilo and Hagen *Furiae numquam nupserunt*) and

σεμναί (*El.* 112n.). Their extraordinary power of sight, useful for agents of punishment, is stressed at *OC* 42 τὰς πάνθ' ὁρώσας Εὐμενίδας, *El.* 113 αἱ τοὺς ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὁρᾷ; cf. Δίκη so designated elsewhere (*El.* 659n., adding Lloyd-Jones and Barns (1963) 213 n. 1 = Lloyd-Jones (1990b) 203 n. 6). The reference to their feet, a familiar feature of their depictions (*El.* 489n.), suggests speedy pursuit (cf. 843, Easterling (2008) 225–6); τανύποδας is the converse of καμπύπους at *Aesch. Sept.* 791, each referring to the alternate stretching and bending of the running leg (thus MD). The name 'Erinyes' is held back almost until the end, as frequently with this word (*El.* 491n.).

Ἐρινῦς appears in most manuscripts with a double nu (similarly 843, [1034], 1390). The seven instances in the *Iliad* have a single nu almost without exception. According to Neumann (1986) 47, double nu is Lesbian (< -*sn*), apparently attested at Alcaeus fr. 129.14 Voigt Ἐ[ρίννυ]ς (Ἐρ[ίνν]υς Hutchinson, perhaps optimistically).

The minority variant τε . . . θ' is preferable to τε . . . δέ because the latter is found when 'the idea of contrast is added to the original idea of addition' (Denniston 513; cf. *El.* 1099n.), and there is no contrast here. ὁρώσας is a predicative participle, as often found in prayers to a deity (see Norden (1913) 166–8). The omission of 836 in two manuscripts and the *Suda* is not textually significant; syntactically essential (N.B. τε in 835), the line was probably left out through confusion over repeated αἶψα.

837–8 μαθεῖν ἐμέ | πρὸς τῶν Ἀτρεϊδῶν ὡς διόλλυμαι τάλας. 'to learn how I am destroyed by the Atreidae in my wretchedness.' For the construction cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1395 ὁρᾷς με, δέσποιν', ὡς ἔχω, τὸν ἄθλιον; *OC* 927–8, Bruhn §27.11.

[839–42 καὶ σφας κακοὺς κάκιστα καὶ πανωλέθρους | ξυναρπάσειαν, ὥσπερ εἰσορῶσ' ἐμέ | αὐτοσφαγῇ πίπτοντα' τὼς αὐτοσφαγεῖς | πρὸς τῶν φιλίστων ἐκγόνων ὀλοίατο.] 'And may they seize the wretched men most wretchedly and utterly destroy them, just as they see me fall through self-slaughter. Just so, slaughtered by their kin, by their dearest offspring, may they perish.' Finglass (2006c) 261–3 discusses the deletion by Wesseling (1751) 126, together with 'gentler remedies' which remove fewer lines. The extraordinary φίλιστος suggests a late interpolation: a fourth-century actor, for example, could scarcely have used such a form. This was then corrected (consciously or otherwise) to unmetrical φιλτάτων in **r.** Quint. Smyrn. 5.465–81 (where Ajax curses first Odysseus, then the army, then Agamemnon) need not be influenced by our passage (*pace* James and Lee on 5.470–5).

The curse is based on the idea of homoeopathy: the target is meant to suffer the same punishment as some person or thing mentioned by the curser. Cf. 1175–9, Hom. *Il.* 3.298–301 Ζεῦ κύδιστε μέγιστε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι, | ὁππότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὅρκια πημήνεια, | ὥδέ σφ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέοι, ὡς ὅδε οἶνος, | αὐτῶν καὶ τεκέων, ἄλοχοι δ' ἄλλοισι δαμείν, Theocr.

2.24–6, Livy 1.24.8 *Iuppiter, populum Romanum sic ferito ut ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam*, Faraone (1999) 42. The coordinate phrases are introduced by ὥσπερ . . . τῶς: cf. 1175–9n. on αὐτως ὅπως, Hom. *Il.* 3.300 ὥδε . . . ὥς. For τῶς elsewhere in classical Greek see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 68 (with addenda), Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 242, Diggle (1996a) 4.

Polyptoton such as κακοὺς κάκιστα commonly features in curses (cf. 1177, 1391, *OR* [248] κακὸν κακῶς, Mastronarde on Eur. *Med.* 805–6, citing non-literary uses), and more generally in vigorous utterances in verse and prose (cf. Renehan (1976) 114–15). Instead of ὥσπερ Blaydes' conjectures χῶσπερ, which connects this clause more closely with the τῶς clause, whereas in the paradosis it is uncomfortably caught in the middle. But emending a brief interpolation is foolhardy, especially one containing φιλίστων. For possible errors involving crasis see 39n. For αὐτο- compounds used of kin-killing see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1091 ff. After ἐκγόνων JJB have τ' (*coni.* Musgrave), which reads like an attempt to improve the unfortunate phrase οἱ φίλιστοι ἐκγονοί.

843–4 ἴτ', ὦ ταχέαι ποίνιμοί τ' Ἐρινύες, | γεύεσθε, μὴ φείδεσθε πανδήμου στρατοῦ. 'Come, o swift and punishing Erinyes: taste the entire army, do not spare them.' γεύεσθε suggests a monstrous picture of the Erinyes feeding on their victims (cf. *El.* 543 δαίσασθαι of Hades), while the violent μὴ φείδεσθε (cf. Eur. *Hec.* 387, *Tro.* 1285, Hdt. 1.80.3 παραίνεσε τῶν . . . ἄλλων Λυδῶν μὴ φειδομένους κτείνειν πάντα τὸν ἐμποδῶν γινόμενον; also 114–15n.) inverts a familiar prayer formula (cf. Fraenkel (1977) 30 'è blasfemo: si prega φείδου, non il contrario'; also *id.* (1957) 411 n. 1, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 2.19.7). Asyndeton lends the imperatives greater force (59–60n.), as often in curses (*El.* 115n.). But the worst horror is saved for the final phrase, in which Ajax extends the curse from the Atridae to the entire Greek army; mutual hostility (cf. 44n.) explains, but hardly justifies, his bitter desire for mass carnage (*pace* M. Heath (1987) 194).

ταχέαι picks up τανύποδας from 837 (n.): 'that is what he wants them (vainly) to be, not what they always were . . . Ajax would cut time short' (Winnington-Ingram (1980) 45 n. 103). For the orthography of Ἐρινύες see 835–7n. Thomas Magister's κεντέϊτε for γεύεσθε will have arisen from confusion with Eur. *Hec.* 387 κεντέϊτε, μὴ φείδεσθ'.

845–9 σὺ δ', ὦ τὸν αἰπὺν οὐρανὸν διφρηλατῶν | Ἥλιε, πατρῶαν τὴν ἐμὴν ὅταν χθόνα | ἴδῃς, ἐπισχῶν χρυσόνωτον ἡνίαν | ἄγγελον ὄτας τὰς ἐμάς μόνον τ' ἐμὸν | γέροντι πατρὶ τῇ τε δυστήνῳ τροφῷ. 'And you, who drive your chariot through the lofty heaven, the Sun, when you catch sight of my ancestral land, check your golden rein and announce my ruin and my death to my aged father and the wretched woman who nursed me.' Di Marco (1997) 145–50 associates this passage with funerary epigrams in which a person who

sees someone's tomb is told to communicate news of the death to the relevant homeland or parents; Ajax's request is on an altogether larger scale. For the sun-god Helios as a messenger cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.270–1 ἄφαρ δέ οἱ ἄγγελος ἦλθεν | Ἥλιος, Aesch. *Ag.* 575–6, Eur. *Held.* 748–54, Dover (1976) 52 n. 6 = (1987) 188 n. 6; for the sun as charioteer see 672–3n. His name is emphasised by its dramatic position (462–3n.), rare line-initial dactylic word (see Fraenkel's edition of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, II 7–8, Diggle (1973) 265 = (1994) 84), and perhaps by the participle with ὦ replacing a vocative (cf. 1272, Moorhouse 30).

Helios' reins are fashioned from gold, the preferred metal of the gods (92–3n.); cf. *OC* 693 ἄ χρυσάνιος Ἀφροδίτα, Costa (1984) 42–3, West (1997) 112 with n. 34, and Lobeck's n. The chariot of Hera and Athena at Hom. *Il.* 5.720–32 is mostly golden (cf. Costa (1984) 40–2); while for Pegasus' golden bridle cf. Pind. *O.* 13.78, Ar. *Pax* 154–6. If the god checks his reins to make the announcement the sun will halt above Salamis for a moment: the momentous cosmic event (cf. Joshua 10.12–14) reflects Ajax's exalted view of his place within the universe. τὸν αἰπὺν οὐρανὸν is an accusative of distance travelled (29–31n.). For the aorist aspect of ἀγγεῖλον, and μόρος 'death', see 826–8n. and 622/3–625/6n. respectively.

850–1 ἥ που τάλαινα, τήνδ' ὅταν κλύη φάτιν, | ἥσει μέγαν κωκυτὸν ἐν πάσῃ πόλῃ. 'Wretched woman, I suppose that when she hears this message, she will raise a great lamentation in the whole city.' Eriboea's grief, already imagined by Tecmessa (507–9) and the chorus (622/3–33), is described by Ajax himself with stark brevity. He sets it within the context of the whole city, magnifying her distress and the significance of his death.

For ἥ που see 176n.; for ἦμι of sound see 627–33n. For κωκυτός of a grieving mother cf. Mnasalces *A.P.* 7.488.3–4 = 2637–8 *HE*, Phalaecus *A.P.* 13.27.5–7 = 2958–60 *HE*; also Anyte *A.P.* 7.486.2 = 681 *HE* μάτηρ ὠκύμορον παῖδ' ἐβόασε φίλαν, Anon. *A.P.* 7.482.3–4 = 3860–1 *HE*, and (more generally) Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.113(c). For news proclaimed 'to the whole city' cf. *El.* 642 εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν, Ant. Thess. *A.Pl.* 290.4 = 506 *GP* δαίμονος ἀκρίτου πᾶσαν ἔπλησε πόλιν. Cassandra combines the two elements in the *Iliad* when, on seeing Hector's body arriving at Troy, she κώκυσεν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα γέγωνέ τε πᾶν κατὰ ἄστν (24.703); this is followed by a description of the grief of Hector's mother and wife (710–12). Inscriptions show πόλῃ to have been the fifth-century Attic dative (see West's Teubner Aeschylus, p. xxxvii).

852–3 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἔργον ταῦτα θρηνεῖσθαι μάτην· | ἀλλ' ἄρκτέον τὸ πρᾶγμα σὺν τάχει τινί. 'But there is no point in vainly lamenting thus: no, the deed must be begun with speed.' Cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 656–7 ἀλλ' οὔτε κλαίειν οὔτ' ὀδυρεσθαι πρέπει, | μὴ καὶ τεκνωθῇ δυσφορώτερος γόος. Grief and lamentation are proverbially useless (581–2n., adding, for μάτην, Ant. 1252, Aesch. *Cho.* 926, Eur. *Phoen.* [1762], Pl. *Tim.* 47b). For the rapid repetition of ἀλλά in

different senses cf. Aesch. fr. 36b/7.1–2 *TrGF*, Davies on *Tr.* 88ff., *El.* 537n. For οὐδὲν ἔργον see 11–13n.

[854–8] Campe (1867) 9–10 deletes this passage (cf. West (1978a) 113–15). The following less extensive deletions were made before him: 853, 855, and 865 by Geel (1853) 206–7 n. 1; 856–8 by Jahn (1869) 177–8; 857 by Morstadt (1864) 45–6 (‘mehr als verdächtig’); 855–65 by Bergk p. liv. Individual notes provide the case against in detail. As a whole, the passage causes an unacceptable delay after 852–3. The trite invocations also contrast with the distinctive and moving vocatives which follow.

[854 ὦ θάνατε θάνατε, νῦν μ’ ἐπίσκεψαι μολῶν:] ‘O Death, Death, come now and visit me!’ Such a command is ‘strange in the mouth of a suicide’ (Macleod *ap.* Fraenkel (1977) 30); ‘it suits rather the helpless sufferer who awaits Death’s pleasure’ (West (1978a) 114). Cf. *Phil.* 797–8 ὦ θάνατε θάνατε, πῶς αἰεὶ καλούμενος | οὕτω κατ’ ἡμᾶρ οὐ δύνη μολεῖν ποτε; Aesch. fr. 255 *TrGF* (*Philoctetes*) ὦ θάνατε παιῶν, μή μ’ ἀτιμάσης μολεῖν | μόνος <γάρ> εἰ σὺ τῶν ἀνηκέστων κακῶν | ἱατρός, ἄλγος δ’ οὐδὲν ἄπτεται νεκροῦ, Eur. *Hipp.* 1373 καί μοι θάνατος παιᾶν ἔλθοι (Hippolytus, in his dying agonies). In some contexts ἐπισκοπέω means not just ‘visit’, but ‘visit and look after’, predicated of a physician or other healer (thus D. Robertson (1944), on Aesch. *Ag.* 13, citing prose parallels); such a sense here would bring an attractive irony.

[855 καίτοι σὲ μὲν κάκει προσανδήσω ξυνών.] ‘And yet I shall meet you and speak with you there too.’ In other words, ‘Come to think of it, there is little point in summoning you now, as I shall have plenty of opportunities to speak with you in the Underworld as well as (καί) here.’ This idea, frigid and unworthy of Ajax’s last moments, does not fit the preceding line: Death is invoked there not for the purpose of conversation, but to bring the sufferer’s life to an end. καίτοι is here ‘used by a speaker in pulling himself up abruptly’ (Denniston 557; contrast 158–9n.). For ἐκεῖ of Hades see 69on.

[856–8 σὲ δ’ ὦ φαεννῆς ἡμέρας τὸ νῦν σέλας, | καὶ τὸν διφρευτὴν Ἥλιον προσεννέπω, | πανύστατον δὴ κοῦποτ’ αὖθις ὕστερον.] ‘And I call upon you, o present blaze of the bright day, and the Sun, the charioteer, for the very last time, and never again later.’ Since Ajax has only just declared that he wishes to end his life without delay, it is incredible that he should utter a three-line invocation of the Sun so shortly after he has addressed it for five. The earlier passage is a grand, moving depiction of the Sun bringing news of Ajax’s death to his parents, the latter a banal and pointless reference to the sun as charioteer. For another interpolated reference to the Sun in this capacity cf. Eur. *Phoen.* [1–2]. West (1978a) 114 argues that 857 is an interpolation within an interpolation, supplied to give a main verb; and that 856 originally read σέλας,

τὸ νῦν, which, followed by πανύστατον, gives an expression like Eur. *Alc.* 207, *Hec.* 411–12, *Her.* 512–13, Ar. *Ach.* 1184. This relies on an assumption that the original interpolator was a competent writer of tragic verse, but we have too little of his work to know this. For the transmitted expression cf. Aesch. fr. dub. 451k(a).2 *TrGF* ἵκνοῦμαι φέγγ[ος] ἡλίου τὸ νῦν.

For the final farewell to the Sun cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1323–4 ἡλίου δ' ἐπεύχομαι | πρὸς ὕστατον φῶς (Cassandra, followed by a wish for vengeance on her killers), Tr. Adesp. fr. 45 *TrGF* ὦ κλεινὸν ὄμμα, νῦν πανύστατόν σ' ἰδὼν | λείπω, φάος γε τοῦμόν· οὐκέτ' εἴμ' ἐγώ, Call. *A.P.* 7.471.1–2 = 1273–4 *HE* εἴπας “Ἥλιε χαῖρε” Κλεόμβροτος ὠμβρακιώτης | ἦλατ' ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ τείχεος εἰς Αἶδην, Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 1184–5. For the form of φαιεννός see 394a–395n. προσενέπω is used to address deities in prayers at Aesch. *Ag.* 162, 1291, Eur. *Hipp.* 99, Pind. *I.* 6.17. The form of [857] is similar to [Aesch.] *PV* 91 καὶ τὸν πανόπτην κύκλον ἡλίου καλῶ.

δῆ often intensifies superlatives (Denniston 207). For the redundancy in κοῦποτ' αὐθις ὕστερον cf. *Ant.* 806–10 ὁρᾷτέ μ'... νέατον δὲ φέγγος λεύσσουσας ἀελίου, | κοῦποτ' αὐθις, Eur. *Hec.* 411–12 ὡς οὔποτ' αὐθις ἀλλὰ νῦν πανύστατον | ἀκτῖνα κύκλον θ' ἡλίου προσόψομαι, *Tro.* 761 νῦν, οὔποτ' αὐθις, μητέρ' ἀσπάζου σέθεν.

859–63 ὦ φέγγος, ὦ γῆς ἱερὸν οἰκείας πέδον | Σαλαμίνας, ὦ πατρῶν ἐστίας βάθρον, | κλειναί τ' Ἀθῆναι, καὶ τὸ σύντροφον γένος, | κρήναι τε ποταμοὶ θ' οἶδε, καὶ τὰ Τρωικά | πεδία προσανδῶ, χαίρετ', ὦ τροφῆς ἐμοί· Ὁ light, o holy ground of my native land of Salamis, o ancestral foundation of my hearth, and famous Athens, and your race kindred to mine, and springs and rivers here, and the Trojan plains I address: farewell, you who have nourished me.' As before at 412a–426/7, at the moment of highest emotion Ajax turns to his surroundings. At Theocr. 1.115–18 the dying herdsman Daphnis takes leave of the local wolves, jackals, and bears, followed by the spring Arethusa and the local rivers. Aesch. fr. 249 *TrGF* (*Philoctetes*) Σπερχιεῖ ποταμὲ βούνομοι τ' ἐπιστροφαί might come from a similar context. The emphasis on place is typically Sophoclean: cf. *Phil.* 1452–68 (*Philoctetes*' valediction to Lemnos), *OC* 668–719 (ode to Colonus), *El.* 2–10 (the Paedagogus' description of the Argolid to the newly-arrived Orestes). Variation in the list prevents monotony (contrast Tr. Adesp. fr. 123a *TrGF* μὰ γῆν, μὰ κρήνας, μὰ ποταμούς, μὰ νάματα). A series of vocatives introduced by ὦ in asyndeton yields to nominatives connected by τε... καὶ... τε... τε..., before a final καὶ introduces an accusative governed by a main verb; cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 88–91, S. *OR* 209/10, Moorhouse 25. For the article with the second vocative cf. *Phil.* 986 ὦ Λημνία χθών καὶ τὸ παγκρατές σέλας.

γῆς... πέδον is a common tragic periphrasis (examples at FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 317); for the interlacing word order γῆς ἱερὸν οἰκείας πέδον see

356–357/8n. Σ^{FH} (p. 194 Chr.) record a variant οἰκοῦντες for οἰκείας; but Ajax, alone to the last, invokes the land rather than its inhabitants. The position of the name Salamis is suitably emphatic for Ajax’s final farewell to his homeland (462–3n.). The enallage in πατρῶον ἐστίας βάθρον is frequent with familial terms, usually (as here) in elevated contexts: cf. *El.* 1374–5 πατρῶα... ἔδη | θεῶν, Bruhn §10.1, Moorhouse 165, Bers (1974) 37. In 861 Ajax refers to the traditional kinship of Salamis with Athens. κλεινός is often used of places (596/7–598n.), and was applied to Athens by Pindar in his famous tribute (fr. 76.3 S–M).

For χαῖρε used by a person about to die Wachter (1998) 65 n. 2 cites (among other passages) *Tr.* 921, Pl. *Phaedo* 116d, Xen. *Cyr.* 8.7.28; for its use with φέγγος cf. Zen. Ath. 2.41 χαῖρε, φίλον φῶς with Bühler (v 46–7), and the Callimachus passage cited at [856–8]n. Climactic τροφής (thus Wunder, 1824 edition, *lacite*, for transmitted τροφεῖς (188–90n.); τροφής in Q^{ac}, immediately corrected by the scribe, is probably a lucky slip) poignantly juxtaposes birth and nourishment with death (M. Heath (1987) 195).

864–5 τοῦθ’ ὕμιν Αἴας τοῦπος ὕστατον θροεῖ, | τὰ δ’ ἄλλ’ ἐν Αἴδου τοῖς κάτω μυθήσομαι. ‘This is the last word that Ajax pronounces to you; the rest I shall speak to those below in Hades.’ ‘Moments before his suicide Aias thus associates himself unequivocally with the dead and renounces any verbal communication with the living’ (Henrichs (1993) 177, contrasting the final words of Oedipus at *OC* 1554–5). By using his own name Ajax ‘is speaking not merely with pride, but seeing himself *sub specie aeternitatis*, like the preceding objects of the landscape’ (MD; cf. 98n.). For the third person verb with the speaker’s name cf. Eur. *El.* 1238–40, Ar. *Ach.* 406, Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 1168, A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 76–7; it reverts to the first person in the following line (426–426/7n.).

For ὕμιν (thus Schaefer for manuscript ὕμιν) see 216–17n. Instead of ὕστατον **r** offers ἔσχατον, an intrusive gloss (28n.): cf. Hesych. υ 846, 847 (p. 132 H/C), *Suda* υ 686 (iv 683.27 Adler). οἱ κάτω is a standard phrase for the dead on curse tablets from at least the fourth century BC (cf. Johnston (1999) 74 n. 114).

Ajax leaves via the skene, presumably in haste. Since the skene no longer represents a building, he does not close the door.

EPIPARODOS AND KOMMOS (866–973)

866–78 The two halves of the chorus enter from separate eisodoi, one slightly ahead of the other. One has searched the western side of the ships (874), the other the eastern (877–8); still searching, they encounter each other. This ‘second parodos’ recalls Odysseus’ earlier hunt for Ajax (thus Burton (1980)

32, Winnington-Ingram (1980) 57). Odysseus tracks him in response to an act of violence, the chorus in order to prevent one. A female brings both Odysseus and the chorus to their goal; the former's mission succeeds, and the latter's fails, but both are appalled by what they discover. The patterning indicates a fresh beginning, as well as indicating the causal link between the events of the night and the suicide.

Their language recalls that of another divided chorus on reconnaissance: Eur. *Ox.* 1258–60 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τρίβον | τόνδ' ἐκφυλάξω τὸν πρὸς ἡλίου βολάς. | — καὶ μὴν ἐγὼ τόνδ', ὅς πρὸς ἐσπέραν φέρει. Lattimore (1958) 60–1 cites our passage as an example of Sophocles' 'sudden lapses of taste' (referring to [Longinus] *Subl.* 33.5): 'after the colossal dignity of Ajax's suicide, the Chorus of his shipmates enter, singing their desperate concern in lines so blithely versed, they must almost be forced to skip as they sing.' Put positively, the colloquialism of the chorus (or at least of the first hemichorus), and their naïve worry for their immediate well-being, brings welcome relief after the terrible grandeur of Ajax's death speech and before the emotionally draining laments over his body.

Twice elsewhere in tragedy a chorus re-enters in the course of a search: Aesch. *Eum.* 244–75, where see Taplin (1977) 379–80, and [Eur.] *Rhes.* 675–727. Each contains astrophic lyric, later followed by strophic song; in each the entrance is irregular (probably piecemeal, or σποράδην, in *Eumenides* and *Rhesus*; from separate eisodoi in *Ajax*). *Eumenides* and *Ajax* also show verbal similarities (866n., 869n.). S.'s satyr-play *Ichneutae* contains a searching scene (fr. 314.91–123 *TrGF*) which is 'mimetic and action-packed' (Zagagi (1999) 193) compared with the essentially static scene in *Ajax*.

Hermann attempts to make these lines respond, without success. On pp. 72–3 of his edition of Euripides' *Hecuba*, and then in his first and second editions of *Ajax*, he arranges as follows: proode (866), strophe 1 (867–9), antistrophe 1 (870–2), strophe 2 (873–4), antistrophe 2 (875–6), epode (877–8). In his third edition he prefers this scheme: strophe 1 (866–9), antistrophe 1 (870–2, adding an iambic dimeter before 870; for this Rattenbury (1936) 7 suggests τὸν ἄνδρ' ὄπου βαίνει πόδα), strophe 2 (873–4), antistrophe 2 (875–6), epode (877–8). Each arrangement requires the deletion of an ἰδοῦ in 870 (thus Hermann, *Hecuba*), and, probably, the replacement of πᾶ πᾶ in 867 by παπαῖ (thus Lachmann (1818) 259 = (1876) 13 and Reisig (1818) 259; Lachmann (1819) 213 retains repeated ἰδοῦ and advocates παπαῖ παπαῖ). Although small, neither change is welcome: repetition of ἰδοῦ may be idiomatic (870n.), while triple πᾶ balances preceding triple πον-. Moreover, sense requires a change of speaker between 871 and 872, but no such change is possible between 868 and 869 in the putative antistrophe. Hermann³ attempts to deal with this problem by further fragmenting the chorus into stanzas too short to be credible.

866 πόνος πόνῳ πόνον φέρει. ‘Toil brings toil on toil.’ The focus on the chorus’s wretchedness will be maintained beyond the discovery of Ajax’s body (900n., 887/8–890n.); the searching chorus in Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* also complains of its affliction πολλοῖς . . . μόχοις (248). Lloyd-Jones prefers ‘Labour brings more labour through labour!’, but the instrumental dative obscures the idea of cumulation: cf. *El.* 235n. μὴ τίκτειν σ’ ἄταν ἄταις, Hes. *Op.* 382 ἔργον ἐπ’ ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι, Simon. fr. 21.7 Poltera αἰῶνι δὲ παύρῳ πόνους ἀμφὶ πόνῳ [v.l. –ον], Hyper. *Epit.* 26 πόνους πόνων διαδόχους ποιούμενοι, Gygli-Wyss (1966) 74–7, Wills (1996) 192 with n. 3, West (2007) 112–13. For triple polyptoton Gygli-Wyss p. 43 n. 4 compares Eur. *Ba.* 905, Aesch. *Pers.* 1041 δόσιν κακὰν κακῶν κακοῖς, Gorg. D–K 82 B 11.16, 18 (II 293.10, 294.5); add Anacr. fr. 359 *PMG* (genitive, dative, accusative), Pl. *Gorg.* 448c (probably a parody of sophist-speak), *Men.* 249c, Dem. 25.101.

867–8 πᾶ πᾶ | πᾶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔβαν ἐγώ; ‘Where, where, where have I not been?’ Triple πᾶ balances triple polyptoton in 866, also through alliteration. For Lachmann’s replacement of πᾶ πᾶ by παπαῖ see 866–78n.

869 κοῦδεις ἐπίσταται ἴμε συμμαθεῖν ἰ τόπος. ‘and no place knows ἴthat I have understood together with it.’ Jebb (p. 232) lists emendations, supplemented and corrected by Dawe, *STS* 1 154–5. A place can ‘know’ something (West (1978a) 115 compares Eur. *Her.* 368 ξύνοιδε Πηνηϊός, ‘is witness to the deeds of Heracles’, and Aesch. test. 162.3 *TrGF* ἀλκὴν δ’ εὐδόκιμον Μαραθῶνιον ἄλσος ἂν εἴποι (perhaps contemporary with Aeschylus: Sommerstein (1995/6) = (2010a) 195–201); add Psalm 103.16 ‘and the place thereof shall know it no more’), but this context needs e.g. ‘No place knows of him, knows where he is’, not the baffling assertion of the paradox. We could replace με συμμαθεῖν with σφε ποῦ νάει (Blaydes¹), σφε ποῦ λάθει (Bellermann⁴ p. 170), or σφε συνναίειν (Jebb: but συνναίειν at *Ti.* 1237, *El.* 241, *Phil.* 892 means ‘living *with*’ something). Alternatively, the sense could be ‘no place knows how to’, followed by e.g. ‘bring me to him’ (thus West (1978a) 115, comparing ἐπίσταται at Aesch. *Ag.* 962 and Eur. *Alc.* 566–7; he suggests e.g. μ’ ἐς ὅμ’ ἄγειν). But τόπος is probably sound, since without it οὐδείς would mean ‘no one’, unhelpfully suggesting consultation with other members of the army; cf. also Aesch. *Eum.* 249 χθονὸς γὰρ πᾶς πεποίμανται τόπος, spoken by the newly-arrived chorus of searching Erinyes. Whatever we replace, there is no palaeographically convincing solution.

Emendations of ἐπίσταται do not persuade. Wecklein (1867) 457–8 suggests ἐπισπᾶται (‘no place attracts (persuades) me to share its knowledge’, Pearson (1917) 61; ‘no place draws me (i.e. arrests my attention) so that I learn at once his whereabouts’, LJ-W/W, *So.*). But this violent verb is inappropriate: the passages cited as parallels predicate it of the power of rhetoric (Thuc. 3.44.4, 5.111.3) or the visual impact of an especially moving action (Xen. *Cyr.*

5.5.10), not a mere inert ‘place’. Thielemann (1849) 13–14 attempts a similar sense with ἐφίσταται; but his one parallel for the sense ‘arrests’ (*Tr.* 339) is unsafe (see Lloyd-Jones (1994) 140–2 = (2005) 127–8). συμμαθεῖν remains problematic with both conjectures. Ll-J/W (in *So.*) claim that the preverb is intensive or perfective; hence presumably ‘at once’ in their translation. Yet the issue is not immediacy, but the chorus’s failure to find Ajax over a period of time.

870 ἰδοὺ ἰδοὺ. ‘There, there!’ The distinction between the particle ἰδοὺ used in response to a sound (cf. *El.* 1410, *OC* 1477/8, Eur. fr. 752f.8 *TrGF* ἰδοὺ κτύπος ὅδε κορτάλων) and verbal ἰδοῦ (which would here be used through synaesthesia: 784–5n.) is often tenuous (see Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 1131). In *Ichneutae* the searching satyrs repeat the same interjection at the climax of their hunt (fr. 314.107 *TrGF*). For Hermann’s deletion of one ἰδοὺ see 866–78n.

871 δοῦπον οὐ κλύω τινά; ‘Don’t I hear a noise?’ οὐ for transmitted αὔ (γὰρ αὔ Triclinius, presumably an emendation aimed at restoring an unsyncopated iambic dimeter) is owed to Firnhaber (1853) 749–50 (*prob.* Dawe, *STS* 1 155). For the reverse corruption cf. *OR* 430 (where a papyrus preserves the truth) and Eur. fr. 365.2 *TrGF*; Dawe also cites examples of interpolated αὔ. At 961 οὔν and αὔ are confused. Wolff² p. 140 first suggests the question mark. The lack of a previous δοῦπος constitutes a *prima facie* case against the paradosis. Ll-J/W (*So.*) claim that αὔ ‘is used in the way in which we use “now” when we say, “What’s the matter now?”’, comparing *Ant.* 7, *El.* 328, *Phil.* 1263, *OC* 1500, fr. 314.124 *TrGF* (all questions, yet Ll-J/W decline to print one here). But this use of ‘now’ implies a previous occasion contrasting with the present situation. That would be the previous period during which a noise was not heard, which would give αὔ an unwelcome breadth of reference, apparently found only in this passage. (Ll-J/W cite four further passages (Aesch. *Ag.* 1215, *Eum.* 254, [Aesch.] *PV* 124, 878) where αὔ should be translated ‘again’.) Jebb prints αὔ but declines to translate (‘Hark – a sudden noise!’).

872 ἡμῶν γε ναὸς κοινόπλουν ὁμιλίαν. ‘Yes, it is us, your companions, who sailed the ship with you.’ ὁμιλίαν, governed by κλύεις (understood from the previous line), is defined by ἡμῶν; the other genitive, ναὸς, depends on κοινό-. For γε in ‘affirmative answers to a question or statement’ see Denniston 130–1. Abstract ὁμιλίαν is used of people at *El.* 417–19, Eur. *Held.* 581 ἀδελφῶν ἡ παροῦσ’ ὁμιλία, *Alc.* 606 ἀνδρῶν Φεραίων εὐμενῆς παρουσία; for ναὸς κοινόπλουν ὁμιλίαν cf. *El.* 1104 ἡμῶν ποθεινὴν κοινόπλουν παρουσίαν, Long (1968) 59, and (for other κοινό- compounds) FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 700. ‘The abstract expression suggests a certain ceremonious formality’ (Parker on the *Alcestis* passage); this hemichorus appear fonder of grand language than their more earthy fellows (cf. Burton (1980) 32–3).

873 τί οὖν δῆ; ‘Well, what then?’ For the ‘urgent or excited question’ Collard (2005a) 373 compares τί οὖν; at Aesch. *Pers.* 787, *Sept.* 208; add fr. 99.4 *TrGF*, Men. *Asp.* 39, *Asp.* 180, Com. Adesp. fr. 1093.79 *PCG*. δῆ reinforces οὖν (Denniston 468–9). FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 306 cite examples of hiatus in this and similar expressions (such as τί ἐστιν;).

874 πᾶν ἐστιβῆται πλευρὸν ἔσπερον νεῶν. ‘The whole western flank of the ships has been traversed.’ For the expression cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 249 (cited 869n.). Perhaps στιβέω (otherwise unattested; restored by a widely-accepted conjecture at [Aesch.] *PV* 791) is a poetic alternative for στειβω (the usual derivative from ὁ στίβος ‘path, track’) which never caught on. For πλευρὸν (or –ά) in a military context cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 7.1.21, *An.* 3.2.37. The adjective ἔσπερος appears to be solely poetic (cf. *OR* 177/8, [Aesch.] *PV* 348); contrast ἐσπέριος, ἐσπερινός. Cf. also πρὸς ἐσπέραν at Eur. *Or.* 1260 (cited 866–78n.).

875–6 (Ημ. α) ἔχεις οὖν; | (Ημ. β) πόνου γε πλῆθος κοῦδὲν εἰς ὄψιν πλέον. ‘So, found anything?’ ‘Yes – a mass of trouble, and nothing more to see.’ Cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 818 (Aδ.) ἔχεις ἔχεις – (Χο.) πημάτων γ’ ἄλις βάρος and *Cycl.* 683 (Χο.) ἔχεις; (Κυ.) κακὸν γε πρὸς κακῶ. Bare ἔχεις may be colloquial: cf. fr. 314.101 *TrGF* ἔχιν ἔοιγμεν (like *Cyclops*, a satyr-play), Ar. *Nub.* 733 ἔχεις τι; For γε see 78n. κοῦδὲν εἰς ὄψιν πλέον is a stylised, elevated way of saying ‘we saw nothing’.

877–8 ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ τὴν ἀφ’ ἡλίου βολῶν | κέλευθον ἀνὴρ οὐδαμοῦ δηλοῖ φανείς. ‘Nor again has the man appeared anywhere along the path from the east.’ Progressive ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ (Denniston 394–5, *El.* 913n.), a characteristically Sophoclean expression, is preferable to the variant οὐδ’ ἐμοί. The latter marks a contrast via the pronoun (‘I haven’t seen him either’), when the distinction is in fact one of place (with 874). A later hand in G has written the variant above the line as a gloss, suggesting the genesis of the corruption (28n.).

ἀπό is used in τὴν ἀφ’ ἡλίου βολῶν | κέλευθον because if Ajax had appeared to the searching chorus, he would have come from the east (their direction of travel). Cf. Hdt. 7.70.1 οἱ . . . ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολέων Αἰθίοπες, which also implies separation (‘the Ethiopians who come from the East’). Contrast Eur. *Or.* 1259 (cited 866–78n.), where πρὸς plus accusative is used because the chorus’s motion towards the east is at issue.

For βόλλω, βολαί of the sun striking the ground see Diggle on Eur. *Pha.* 3, adding *Ion* 1134 (*coni.*), *Ba.* 14 ἡλιόβλητος, Timoth. fr. 800.1–2 *PMG* = Hordern, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 2.15.10 *ictus*. The same idea is predicated of snow: cf. χιόνος . . . βολαί (Eur. *Ba.* 662), χιονόβλητος (Ar. *Nub.* 270). These parallels support βολῶν over the variant βολῆς. The former was

corrupted to *μολῶν* via a common minuscule error (622/3–625/6n.), later ‘corrected’ in some manuscripts to *μολών*.

For the accusative of extent (usually with verbs of motion; here motion is implied) see 29–31n. For *άνήρ* (Brunck) see 9–10n. For the syntax of *δηλοῖ φανείς* see 470–2n. *δῆλος φανείς* (B. Heath (1762) 9) is no improvement. Collard (2005a) 377 cites tragic and comic parallels for *φαίνομαι* used absolutely to mean ‘appear, show up’; the usage, he argues, is not colloquial.

879/80–973 In this epirrhematic section the chorus deliver sung lyric, individual spoken trimeters, and spoken exclamations; Tecmessa’s part consists of spoken trimeters, arranged in singles, pairs, and extended passages. The discovery of the body, and entrance of Tecmessa, take place within the responding section; in *Electra* Clytemnestra’s death and Orestes’ entry are similarly placed (1398–1441). The effect is one of variety, after the monumental speech which precedes: speakers, manner and length of delivery, and tone continually change in what remains a highly balanced and patterned unit. Tecmessa takes the lead throughout. She finds the body (891), identifies the cause of death (906–7), covers it (915–17), asks the vital question ‘what do we do now?’ and prays for Teucer’s swift return (920–2), acknowledges the prospect of slavery (944–5), sees the divine background to the dreadful event (950), and puts the blame on Odysseus (952–3, 971). The chorus generally react to and develop her observations, providing in song an emotional commentary on the developing scene.

Predictably, bitter laments for the dead Ajax dominate. But Tecmessa and the chorus do not simply focus on present misery; they explore both past (explaining the suicide) and future (analysing its consequences). The attention to explanations and consequences does not detract from the intensity of current grief; it rather intensifies it, as Tecmessa and the chorus search for something which could account for this awful act, and imagine the suffering which it will go on causing. The chorus’s first attempt to explain the death is to blame themselves (908/9–912), a psychologically convincing reaction. A little after the initial shock, they acknowledge Ajax’s responsibility, in terms of his character and his reaction to the Judgment of the Arms (925/6–936, where see Winnington-Ingram (1980) 163 n. 31). It falls to Tecmessa to present the widest (though still only partial) perspective, attributing the death to the gods, and specifically Athena (950–3). Such explanations are not mutually inconsistent; they suggest emotionally distraught people groping towards an incomplete understanding of the reasons for their grief.

As regards consequences, the chorus first react to the news by giving up hope of a safe return home (900–2); Tecmessa develops that theme by anticipating the prospect of slavery for herself and Eurysaces (944–5). By her closing speech, however, she again takes a broader perspective, describing the disastrous effect

that Ajax's death will have on the whole army (961–5). Having made this wider point, she finishes the section, and, fittingly, her own part, with a poignant reminder of the unique intensity of her own grief (971–3).

STROPHIC PAIR (879/80–924 ~ 925/6–973)

(1) 879/80	925/6	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2δ
(2) 880/1	926/7	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2δ
(3) 882/3	928/9	—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	D δ
(4) 884	930	—υ—υ—υ—	D
(5) 885/6	931	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2ia
(6) 886/7	932	—υ—υ—υ—	δ
(7) 887/8	933	—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2cr
(8) 888	934	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2δ
(9) 889	935	—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	cr δ
(10) 890	936	—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	cho 2ia

891–9 ~ 937–45: Responding spoken dialogue between Tecmessa and the chorus (iambic trimeters and bacchiacs).

(11) 900	946	—υ—υ—υ—	δ
(12) 901	947	—υ—υ—υ—υ—	enopl
(13) 902	948	—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	cr ia
(14) 903	949	—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2cr

904–7 ~ 950–3: Responding spoken dialogue between Tecmessa and the chorus (iambic trimeters).

(15) 908/9	954/5	—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	2δ
(16) 910	956	υ—υ—υ—	δ
(17) 911	957	υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	υε~D
(18) 912	958	υ—υ—υ—υ—	ia ia _λ
(19) 913	959	—υ—υ—υ—	D
(20) 914	960	υ—υ—υ—υ—	reiz

915–24 ~ 961–73 (after deletions): Responding speeches by Tecmessa.

The three lyric sections in each stanza begin with dochmiacs, marking an increase of agitation when they first appear at 879/80–890. These continue throughout the first section but disappear after the opening of the second and third. Other rhythms in the lyrics are often associated with dochmiacs: hemiepe, iambics, and cretics (West (1982) 111–12, L. Parker (1997) 43, 66–7).

Since the final syllable of ποθι stands in a long position, and since –θι πλ– cannot generate a long (*El.* 853n.), I have marked period end after (5). Willink (2002) 61 = (2010) 396–7 avoids the break by positing an alternative colometry for (4–6):

—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—	Dυε~
—υ—υ—υ—υ—	D—

But this involves changing $\omega\mu\acute{o}\phi\rho\omega\nu$ in 931 to $\omega\mu\acute{o}\phi\rho\omicron\nu$ (thus Elmsley (1805/6 edn); $-\phi\rho\omicron\nu$ ‘rec.’ *teste* Pearson), when that adjective is better predicated of Ajax himself than his cries (cf. 926/7 $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{o}\phi\rho\omega\nu$).

Period end after (7) is required since in the strophe final $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ needs to scan long and the following word begins with a vowel. To avoid it, Willink (2002) 61 with n. 36 = (2010) 397 with n. 36 tentatively suggests scanning $\sigma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\iota\alpha\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ as $-\sim\sim$. Elsewhere in tragic lyric the first syllable of $\sigma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is certainly short at Eur. *Alc.* 408, *El.* 1152, *Tro.* 595, *IT* 651, *Phoen.* 1558, and ancepts at *Suppl.* 1074, *El.* 1170. As the syllable is frequently long in trimeters, the absence of a certainly long case among eight lyric cases justifies Willink’s hesitation. Also, $-\sim\sim$ is a considerably less common form of cretic than $\sim\sim-$ (cf. Parker (1997) 43–4). The split resolution introduced by this prosody is probably not a problem, since $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ can be taken as a postpositive going closely with the previous word.

For the lonely cretic ‘sandwiched between dochmiacs’ in (8–9) see Diggle (1990) 107 = (1994) 373, who cites parallels from S. and Aeschylus. (10) ‘begin[s] with apparently dochmiac rhythm, but proceed[s] in such a way as to constitute a trimeter *ch 2ia*’ (Willink (2002) 62 = (2010) 398, comparing [Eur.] *Rhes.* 464–6 ~ 830–2).

The colometry for (12–13) results from small textual changes in both strophe and antistrophe: for these, together with an alternative, see 901–2n. For the enoplian colon in (12) see (11) in the metrical analysis to 348–429. The hemiepes rhythm is apparent; we could just as well have written (12–13) as dactylo-epitrite ($-D | e-e$). Willink (2002) 62 = (2010) 398 gives parallels for the rare division $-\sim- | - | -\sim-$ in the antistrophe at (13).

For the colon in (17), the ‘iambelegus’, see (7–9) in the metrical analysis to 172–200. For the reizianum in (20) as a clausula see (33) in the metrical analysis to 348–429.

879/80–887/8 τίς ἄν δῆτά μοι, τίς ἄν φιλοπόνων | ἄλιαδᾶν ἔχων ἀπνους ἄγρας | ἢ τίς Ὀλυμπιάδων θεᾶν, ἢ ῥυτῶν | Βοσπορίων ποταμῶν, τὸν ὠμόθυμον εἶ ποθι | πλαζόμενον λεύσσω | ἄπύοι; ‘Who, then, who among the labour-loving fishermen employed in sleepless hunting, or who among the goddesses of Olympus, or the flowing streams of the Bosphorus, could call out to me that he can see the fierce-hearted man wandering somewhere?’ Zagagi (1999) 185 n. 16 compares Aesch. fr. 46a.17–21 *TrGF* (*Diktyoulkoi*) for a searching party’s cry for help. The language marks the scope of the request, encompassing sea and land, mortals and immortals. The proper names suggest the chorus’s familiarity with, and feeling for, the wider landscape (cf. 859–63n.). Ironically, their quarry is nearby, and their informant will be their familiar friend and guide Tecmessa; ironically also, Ajax has only just said farewell to the locality to which they now appeal for help in finding him.

For τῖς ἄν with the optative expressing a question nearly equivalent to a wish see 388–91n. For repetition at the start of successive dochmiacs see 348–349/50n. For repetition in the same place in strophe and antistrophe see (19) in the metrical analysis to 348–429.

δῆτα for transmitted δῆ is owed to Hermann (1796) 441; the same error occurs at 1360. The inferential sense (42n.; in a question-wish at Aesch. *Ag.* 622) fits the context: since we have found nothing, the chorus sing, who can tell us where he might be? Pardini (1999) 103–4 keeps δῆ, seeing responsion between an iambic ‘foot’ and a cretic (√—!— — ~ √—!— —). Once we abandon metra for feet and chop metrical units into pieces this small, almost anything is possible.

ἄλιόδης ‘fisherman’ (*hapax*) may be a (poetic?) alternative to ἄλιεύς (so Björck (1950) 307), which is found in epic (Hom. *Od.* 12.251, 24.419, [Hes.] *Scut.* 214, Choer. Sam. fr. dub. 21.1 *PEG*; cf. Kurt (1979) 212–13), prose, and comedy, but not tragedy. (The scholia to Plato attribute the phrase ὥσπερ ἄλιεύς πηγαίς to S.’s satyr-play *Amphiaraios*, fr. 115 *TrGF*; this may be corrupt, since the fragment is quoted to illustrate a proverb containing those words, and even if genuine, would only underline the contrast between satyr-play and tragedy.)

For ἄγρᾱ, ἄγρη connected with fishing see West on Hes. *Th.* 442–3, Gow on Theocr. 7.60. The minority variant ἔδρᾱς removes the emphasis on ceaseless activity so characteristic of the fisherman (cf. Pl. *Soph.* 220d, where the activity is described as taking place night and day, [Theocr.] 21.1–5, Luke 5.5). For ἔχων . . . ἄγρᾱς see 562–4n.

Mount Olympus of Mysia is mentioned three times in Herodotus (1.36.1 ἐν τῷ Μυσίῳ Ὀλύμπῳ, 1.43.1, 7.74.2, on which see D. Müller (1997) 886–8; cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 11.1 and further references in Ruge (1942)); at its foot lay the city of Prusa. Today it is identified with Mount Uludağ. Since this Mount Olympus is far to the east of the Troad, the chorus are here identifying Olympus with Mount Ida, as in the only other reference to the mountain in tragedy, at fr. 522.2 *TrGF* (cited 599/600–605n.), where it is located ‘somewhere in the land of Ida’ (cf. Strabo 10.3.14, who quotes the fragment, and complains about this conflation).

In place of Ὀλυμπιάδων Elmsley (1805/6 edn) tries –αδᾶν (–αδαν N, perhaps influenced by the ending of ἄλιαδᾶν), which gives a derivation from the unattested Ὀλυμπιάδης rather than Ὀλυμπιάς. Corruption of θεᾶν to θεῶν (the regular Attic word for goddesses) in most manuscripts (posited for Eur. *Ba.* 370 by Diggle (2006) 104) would have been assisted by the association of θεοί with Olympus (e.g. *Phil.* 315, Hom. *Il.* 1.18, Pind. fr. 75.1–2 S–M).

For Greek river gods see Weiss (1984). The Bosphorus is properly the strait connecting the Black Sea with the Sea of Marmara, while the Hellespont connects the Sea of Marmara with the Aegean. Here the term refers to the

Hellespont (the ‘real’ Bosphorus being far away), just as in Aeschylus’ *Persae* the terms are interchangeable (contrast *Ant.* 966/7–969/70 and probably Eur. fr. 1007a+b.5 *TrGF*, where the precise sense is found; Hellespont and Bosphorus may also be distinguished at S. fr. 503). See further FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 546.

Ἴδρις after Βοσπορίων ποταμῶν in most manuscripts does not correspond to the antistrophe; it is missing in Jb, Mosq. gr. 504, and a Dresden manuscript (*teste* Seidler (1809) 438), while π**α Ἴδρις μῶν in Q suggests that Ἴδρις stood above the line in an exemplar (as a gloss written by someone who did not see that the genitives go with τίς), and was unthinkingly introduced into the text in an absurd position (so Dawe, *STS* 1 155–6; cf. 28n., 295n.). The poetic Ἴδρις, hardly a glossator’s word, will have been suggested by αἰδρις in 911 (thus Dawe). The alternative to deletion is to add a word of the shape υ— at the end of 930, but this gives unwelcome metre (a glyconic in an environment otherwise free from aeolo-choriambic). None of the proposed supplements is attractive (ἀναξ Elmsley (1814) 469–70, ἄρα Hermann¹, ἀεῖ Reisig (1818) 258–9).

For ὤμος applied to Ajax see 205–7n. εἴ ποθι introduces an abbreviated construction, in which the verb in the protasis is understood from the participle λεύσσω a few words later in the main clause (179–181/2n.). πλάζω, πλάζομαι is attested several times for epic, and once each in elegiac, iambic, and Herodotus, but not elsewhere in tragedy; it may have been felt as an epicism. For the orthography of λεύσσω see 259–62n. ἀπύω/ῆπύω is attested for epic and lyric, and once in comic trimeters (Ar. *Eq.* 1023), as well as in tragedy, where all the instances are in lyric and anapaests, except for [Eur.] *Rhes.* 776.

887/8–890 σχέτλια γάρ | ἐμέ γε τὸν μακρῶν ἀλάτῃν πόνων | οὐρίῳ μὴ πελάσαι δρόμῳ, | ἀλλ’ ἀμενηνὸν ἄνδρα μὴ λεύσσειν ὅπου. ‘For it is cruel that I, the wanderer, who have endured long toils, should not meet with a favouring course, but should fail to see where the enfeebled man is.’ With charming unselfconsciousness, and a hint of realism, the chorus focus not on the possibility of Ajax’s death, but on their own wretchedness. They are indignant that this still-unfinished task is added to their many toils, and that a traumatised man like Ajax should have eluded them for so long (cf. Hermann¹).

σχέτλιος, derived from σχεθεῖν, originally ‘implies a withholding of one’s natural reactions of pity and fear’ (J. Wilson (1971) 293). In Homer and Herodotus it denotes cruelty or, occasionally, inhuman courage; in tragedy ‘cruel’ is again the usual sense, but ‘miserable’ is attested in *Prometheus Vinculus* and Euripides. Of the four other Sophoclean instances, it is a strong term of abuse at *Phil.* 369 (Neoptolemus to the Atridae, who have refused to return his father’s weapons) and 930 (Philoctetes to Neoptolemus, after discovering his deceit), and a statement of outrage referring to excessive audacity at *Tr.* 879/80 (referring to the cruelty of Deianira towards herself by the manner

of her suicide) and *Ant.* 47 (Ismene to Antigone, on hearing of her proposed disobedience). In each case the adjective suggests the question ‘How could you bring yourself to do this?’ In our passage ‘miserable’ or ‘hard’ (Jebb) would be possible, but ‘cruel’ is better paralleled, and by its exaggeration suits the outraged tone of the chorus (whose plight, objectively speaking, does not approach that of, say, Philoctetes or Deianira). Wilson (1971) 293–4 with n. 18 corrects and supplements LSJ⁹ s.v. on the archaic and classical use of the adjective. For the predicative neuter plural adjective cf. 1126, Bruhn §20, Headlam on Herodas 6.80, Moorhouse 12.

The genitives in τὸν μακρῶν ἀλάτταν πόνων stand for the cognate accusative in the implied phrase ἀλάτθαι πόνους (thus Schneidewin; cf. perhaps Eur. *Andr.* 305–6 πόνους [v.l. μόχθους] . . . δεκέτεις ἀλάληντο, referring to the Trojan War). The construction is paralleled by [Aesch.] *PV* 900 δυσπλάνοις Ἡρας ἀλατείαις πόνων; editors have doubted the text, but West (1990) 310–11 vindicates it as modelled on our passage (which he translates as ‘the roamer through . . . long toils’). The alternative, which takes μακρῶν . . . πόνων as genitives of quality (cf. West’s alternative ‘the roamer characterized by long toils’), needlessly invokes a rare construction (*El.* 19n., Pind. *P* 11.34n.).

οὐρίων . . . δρόμων in L^{ac}, with a genitive after πελάζω (707–10n.), supposes corruption elsewhere to the commoner dative (cf. *El.* 683n.); but the preceding genitive plurals could have encouraged an error in L. Epic ἀμενηνός ‘weak’, ‘powerless’ occurs four times in the formula νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, and in other contexts. It is found in Hippocrates, while Aristophanes uses it twice: *Av.* 686 (an epicising context), and fr. 233.2 *PCG* (a father testing his son on Homeric vocabulary). The only other tragic instance is at Eur. *Tro.* 193, where Hecuba describes herself as a νεκύων ἀμενηνὸν ἄγαλμα in a conspicuously epicising phrase. The sense here is obscure; but the common use of the adjective to describe the dead adds a proleptic irony, as this is the final description of Ajax before his death is announced. Reminiscence of 81 perhaps encouraged the minority variant μεμνηνός (*coni.* Musgrave). For the absence of a verb in the subordinate clause see 31–3n. For the orthography of λεύσσω see 259–62n.

891–9 Tecmessa appears in the doorway of the skene. The chorus hear her at 891, but do not see her until 894; they turn in the direction of the shout only at 892. The alternative, that Tecmessa enters between 892 and 894, is improbable: why should she deliver one cry in the grove, and then another outside it? From her position in the skene doorway she can see the body, which remains hidden from the chorus (cf. 897, 912–14). Her attendants remain unseen until they bring on the body (925/6–936n.); we do not want to crowd the doorway. For entries within a lyric structure see Taplin (1977) 174 n. 3.

891 ἰὼ μοί μοι: manuscripts offer between one and three instances of ἰὼ, with two considerably the best attested. In the corresponding line 937 all witnesses have a single ἰὼ, except for OV, which have two. At 939 a single ἰὼ is guaranteed because 893 (with which it corresponds) is textually secure. We should follow the metrical form of 893 ~ 939 and read ἰὼ μοί μοι in 891 ~ 937, which is marginally the best attested overall.

892 τίνος βοή παράυλος ἐξέβη νάπους; ‘Whose shout came out of the grove nearby?’ παράυλος means ‘nearby’ (< αὐλή ‘dwelling place’) in its two other Sophoclean instances (*OC* 785, fr. 503.2 *TrGF*); similarly ξυμπάραυλος (*harpax*, fr. 730c.3.18) and ξύναυλος (609–11n.). The alternative derivation, from αὐλός ‘pipe’, would mean ‘discordant’, not ‘mournful’. The scholia offer both senses (p. 200 Chr.). The key point is that a cry has struck the chorus *from nearby*: perhaps they have been on the right track after all. See also Introduction pp. 15–16.

νάπος and νάπη usually mean ‘mountain-valley, glen’; for ‘thicket’ (questioned by Gow and Page on Adaeus *A.P.* 9.300.1 = 27 *GP*) cf. *OC* 157 (the grove of the Erinyes) and *Ti.* 436 (where ἄκρον Οἰταῖον νάπος cannot denote a valley; as 1191–9 reveal, this is a heavily wooded area). According to [Cic.] *Rhet. Her.* 1.18 Ajax kills himself in a *silva*.

893 ἰὼ τλήμων. ‘Alas for my wretchedness!’ The minority variant τλήμων shows corruption from the nominative of exclamation to the more frequent vocative.

894–5 τὴν δουρίληπτον δύσμορον νύμφην ὀρώ | Τέκμησσαν, οἴκτω τῷδε συγκεκραμένην. ‘I see the spear-won bride, unhappy Tecmessa, steeped in this lament.’ Most manuscripts have δουρίληπτον; for the error cf. 211. For Tecmessa as a spear-won bride see 211–13n. For people ‘mixed’ with troubles cf. *Ant.* 1311 δειλαίᾳ δὲ συγκέκραμαι δύα, *Ar. Plut.* 853 οὕτω πολυφόρῳ συγκέκραμαι δαίμονι, *S. El.* [1485]n.; for this verb more generally of mixing troubles cf. *Aesch. Sept.* 739–41, *Cho.* 744–5. οἴτῳ in *J^{yp}* is inferior to the majority reading; the chorus have heard Tecmessa’s grief, but are yet unaware of her fate.

896 οἴχωκ’, ὀλωλα, διαπεπόρθημαι, φίλοι. ‘I am gone, I am dead, I am destroyed, my friends.’ For the ascending tricolon cf. *El.* 13n., 1380, Mastroianni on Eur. *Phoen.* 1193, Asclepiades *A.P.* 5.162.3 = 844 *HE* οἴχου’, Ἔρωτες, ὀλωλα, διοίχομαι. The perfects give a ‘more absolute sense of completeness’ than other tenses would (Campbell). οἴχωκα is the classical, ὄχωκα the Hellenistic form (cf. Wackernagel (1916b) 254, West’s apparatus on Hom. *Il.* [10.252]). H’s ὄχωκ’ will reflect the view of some grammarians that ὄχωκα is correct (cf. Herodian, Choeroboscus 554.4–10 = π 79.13–17 Hilgard).

For διαπεπόρθημαι used personally cf. 1198, *Tr.* 1104 ἐκπεπόρθημαι, Eur. fr. 605.3 *TrGF* φίλους... πορθεῖν, *Hipp.* 541–2, *Phoen.* [564–5], LSJ⁹ s.v. πορθέω 3.

897 τί δ' ἔστιν; 'What is the matter?'

898–9 Αἶας ὄδ' ἡμῖν ἄρτίως νεοσφαγῆς | κείται, κρυφαίῳ φασγάνῳ περιπτυχῆς. 'Ajax lies here, newly slaughtered, enfolded round his hidden sword.' For the pleonasm ἄρτίως νεοσφαγῆς cf. *Tr.* 1130 (same phrase), *Ant.* 1282–3 τέθνηκε... ἄρτι νεοτόμοισι πλήγμασιν. For Ajax's 'hidden' sword see 657–9n. For περι- in contexts of impaling see 826–8n.

900 ὧμοι ἐμῶν νόστων 'Alas for my homecoming!' Even now the chorus focus on their own well-being (cf. Fraenkel (1977) 31), but at a new and more serious level. No longer concerned about the extent of their wanderings, they face the prospect of never returning home. Their assumption that this would be the consequence of Ajax's death powerfully expresses their dependence on him (contrast the view of Foley (2003) 15 n. 69 that 'Sophocles' choruses are not personally endangered by the fate of the actors'). This theme, continued and elaborated in 901–2, is repeated by Teucer (980, 1006–23) and the chorus (1211–1215/16). An altruistic statement of sorrow for the departed would not have had the same impact. But their subsequent expression of sympathy for Tecmessa indicates that their focus is not simply on themselves.

For the orthography of ὧμοι see 227/8–232n. Here and in the following line only Triclinius has ὧμοι, while other manuscripts have ἰώ μοι; for the corruption see 372–3n.

901–2 ὧμοι, κατέπεφνες, ἄναξ, | τόνδε συνναύταν, τάλας 'Alas, you have killed me, lord, your fellow sailor, wretch that I am.' The chorus continue the idea 'now that Ajax is dead, I have no protection' implied in 900, but also recall the lamentatory motif 'you have killed me by your death' (*El.* 808n.). Ajax and the chorus had a particular bond as fellow sailors (348–349/50n.).

The paradosis offers — — — — — | — — — — — in the strophe, — — — — — | — — — — — in the antistrophe (947–8), in a metrical context preceded by a dochmiac and followed by a cretic dimeter. Changing ἰώ μοι to ὧμοι in the strophe at 901 (as also required in 900) restores responsion at the start. Our choice is now between two alternatives, of which I adopt the former:

(i) follow Hermann³ by printing τάλας for transmitted ἰώ τάλας in the strophe, and ἄναυδ' ἔργ' for transmitted ἄναυδον ἔργον in the antistrophe, giving — — — — — | — — — — — (*enopl* | *cr ia*).

(ii) add a syllable in 901, follow Triclinius by writing ὦ τάλας for transmitted ἰώ τάλας in 902 (cf. 372–3n.), and keep the antistrophe unchanged. Proposals for the added syllable include ἄναξ <με> (Elmsley (1814) 471–2), <καί>

905 τίνος ποτ' ἄρ' ἔπραξε χειρὶ δύσμορος; 'By whose hand did the unhappy man bring this about?' (Lloyd-Jones). This question typically follows news of a suicide: cf. *Ant.* 1176 πότερα πατρώας, ἢ πρὸς οἰκείας χερὸς; *OR* 1236 ὦ δυστάλαινα, πρὸς τίνος ποτ' αἰτίας; *Tr.* 882–8. Ἄρα after an interrogative probably adds liveliness to the question (cf. 1185–1185/6, Denniston 39–40).

The strophe has one more syllable than the antistrophe. Since the other iambic trimeters in this strophic pair are unsyncopated, the presumption is that these are too, so we should emend the antistrophe (951n.). Wolff¹ deletes ἄρ', while Hermann² emends ἔπραξε to ἔρξε, taking ἔπραξε as a gloss (28n.). But the particle makes sense and there is no obvious motive for its intrusion, while aorist indicative ἔρξα is attested for tragedy only at Aesch. *Sept.* 923 (cf. Diggle (1981b) 96 = (1994) 213).

906 αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοῦ, δῆλον· 'By his own, it is clear.' For 'similarly emphatic (and postponed) announcements of suicide' Davies on *Tr.* 891 compares *OR* 1237 and *Ant.* 1177. For the smooth breathing on αὐτοῦ see *El.* 285n. For parenthetic δῆλον cf. fr. 585.1 *TrGF*, Pearson on fr. 63.1, Alexis fr. 140.11 *PCG*, Theocr. 10.13.

906–7 ἐν γὰρ οἱ χθονὶ | πηκτὸν τόδ' ἔγχος περιπετοῦς κατηγορεῖ. 'This sword fixed by him in the earth declares that he fell on it.' περιπετοῦς for transmitted περιπετὲς is owed to Musgrave. Since the sword in Ajax's body is fixed in the earth, he must have fallen upon it. For κατηγορεῖω in this sense with the genitive cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 271 εὖ γὰρ φρονούντος ὄμμα σου κατηγορεῖ, *Sept.* 438–9, Schadewaldt (1936) 42 = (1970) 1326–7. Another possibility (if the adjective without explicit noun is thought offensive) is περιπεσεῖν (thus MDR). The paradosis would mean 'on which he fell', a passive whose boldness was noted by Eustathius (644.47 = II 321.19–322.1 Van der Valk; Σοφοκλῆς... ἔγχος περιπετὲς εἰπεῖν ἐτόλμησεν, ὥ περιπέπτωκεν Αἴας). Elsewhere in tragedy, when κατηγορεῖω is used in this sense, its object is always expressed (as a personal genitive); and no other compound of πίπτω ending in –πετής (examples at Battezzato (2000)) occurs with a passive sense (Lloyd-Jones (1952) 132–3 = (1990a) 301). The combination of these points swings the balance of probabilities in favour of the emendation (*pace* Hooker (1968) 61 = (1996) 565). Unfamiliarity with the construction, together with the proximity of ἔγχος, led to the corruption.

For comparable personifications in S. see Long (1968) 113 ('An axe has a memory (*El.* 485); lamentation can wear wings (ibid. 242); a sword can make announcements...'). For the position of οἱ see 587–8n. For τόδ' of an invisible object see 815–65n. For ἔγχος 'sword' see 95n. For περι– in contexts of impaling see 826–8n.

908/9–914 The chorus's initially self-interested response now yields to a lively concern for their dead master's fate, as they assume responsibility far beyond any just apportionment of blame.

908/9–910 ὥμοι ἐμᾶς ἄτας. οἷος ἄρ' ἑμάχθης, | ἄφαρκτος φίλων 'Alas for my ruin! All alone, then, you were bloodied, unprotected by your friends.' The chorus's language is more appropriate for a man killed by the enemy than a suicide. For the orthography of ὥμοι see 227/8–232n. ὥμοι is only in Triclinius, with ἰώ μοι in other manuscripts; for the corruption see 372–3n. For ἄτη with a personal genitive see 641/2–643n. οἷος is elaborated by ἄφαρκτος φίλων. The chorus's words reply to Tecmessa's statement αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοῦ, δῆλον (note ἄρα: 233–4n.); they focus not on the kind of man that Ajax was (οἷος), or the mechanism of his death (οἶον, *coni.* Blaydes¹ p. 329), but on the fact that he died alone.

ἑμάχθης is Radermacher's reinterpretation of manuscript αἰμ–. The latter shows the omission of the temporal augment (*El.* 147n.), which S. dispenses with only when compelled by the metre. The one other exception which Dawe (*STS* 1 156) cites, *Ant.* 982, is textually insecure for other reasons (see Griffith); from the other tragedians Lautensach (1899) 180 compares Aesch. *Pers* 652 ἀπόλλυ (but ἀπώ– is also attested), *Sept.* 923 ἐρξάτην (cf. Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1529), and Eur. *IA* 797 ἀλλάχθη (if genuine, print ἡλ–). *Ex hypothesi* there will be no metrically guaranteed instances of absence of temporal augment which are not required by the metre; but given that ἑμ– and αἰμ– have equal authority, it is perverse to print the more unusual alternative. (Weakly-attested ἡμ– (i.e. ῆμ–) shows loss of Doric alpha, and thus is not evidence for Radermacher's text.)

Dindorf (1836) 320 restores ἄφαρκτος for transmitted ἄφρακτος. L preserves the correct orthography at *Ant.* 958 κατὰφαρκτος, as do inscriptions (Threatte 1 477); see further Wecklein (1869) 43–4, A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 579–81. For the negative compound adjective followed by a genitive cf. *Ant.* 847/8 φίλων ἄκλαυτος, 321–2n. Triclinius adds τῶν before φίλων, presumably to give an equal number of syllables (though not proper responsion) with 956, where in common with the manuscripts, Triclinius's text has the extra ὁ.

911–12 ἐγὼ δ' ὁ πάντα κωφός, ὁ πάντ' ἄιδρις, | κατημέλησα. 'But I, wholly obtuse, wholly ignorant, neglected him.' The prominent, perhaps slightly naïve, repetition expresses self-loathing. For πάντα strengthening adjectives cf. 1415, *OC* 1458 τὸν πάντ' ἄριστον... Θησέα, Cratinus fr. 1.3 *PCG* πάντ' ἄριστῳ, *El.* 301n.

912–14 πᾶ πᾶ | κεῖται ὁ δυστράπελος | δυσώνυμος Αἴας; 'Where, where does Ajax lie, that intractable man with the ill-omened name?' The prominently repeated πᾶ might recall 868, underlining the shift of mood: a rescue operation has turned into a body hunt.

For repeated (but different) adjectives in *δυσ-* applied to the same noun cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 746 *δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος*, [Aesch.] *PV* 690 *δυσθέατα καὶ δύσοιστα*, Eur. *IT* 694 *μέλαθρα . . . δυσσεβῆ καὶ δυστυχῆ*, Pl. *Leg.* 863b, *Tim.* 87a, West (2007) 110. Omission of *καὶ* makes the effect more striking. *δυσ-τράπελος* is the only instance of *-τράπελ-* in tragedy; it and *εὐτράπελος* both occur once in comedy (Heniochus fr. 4.4 *PCG*, Ar. *Vesp.* 469), and several times in prose (especially philosophical texts). The distribution suggests that it is of no fixed register. Arist. *EE* 1234a4–5 defines *ὁ εὐτράπελος* as *μέσος τοῦ ἀγροίκου καὶ δυστραπέλου καὶ τοῦ βωμολόχου*.

Only DOBBbJb and Mosq. gr. 504 omit the unmetrical (and curiously emphatic) *ὁ* before *δυσώνυμος*. For the error see 205–7n. *ὁ* in front of the first *δυσ-*, especially so soon after repeated *ὁ πάντα*, encouraged its interpolation before the second. *δυσώνυμος* refers to the evil etymology of Ajax's name (430–1n.).

915 οὔτοι θεατός: 'He must not be seen.' οὔτοι emphasises the negative (Denniston 543–4).

915–16 ἀλλά νιν περιπτυχῆ | φάρει καλύψω τῷδε παμπήδην 'Rather, I shall cover him completely in this enfolding shroud'. Covering a dead body is fundamental to many cultures (cf. Meuli (1975) 1 314 with n. 3). The removal of Tecmessa's φάρος is an act full of pathos; if it is a veil (thus Garvie) rather than a cloak, it could have evoked the pitiable unveiling of Andromache at the death of Hector (Hom. *Il.* 22.468–72; Finglass (2009a)). From her position in the doorway she could remove the garment and cast it on the dummy, still just out of sight; or wait until the end of the speech, move briefly out of sight behind the skene, cover the dummy, and return when her attendants carry out the body. The latter is more probable, as it would be awkward for Tecmessa to deliver this speech while facing towards an unseen object behind the skene and simultaneously divesting herself of a piece of clothing.

The first syllable of φάρει is anceps. Both Attic φάρος and Ionic φῶος (both < *φαρφος) are attested in tragedy, but in the word's five other occurrences in S. φάρος is metrically guaranteed. Hence we should assume short alpha here too (cf. Björck (1950) 150–1, West's Teubner Aeschylus, p. lii). παμπήδην is attested elsewhere only at Theogn. 615, Aesch. *Pers.* 729, fr. 154a.16 *TrGF*, Nic. *Alex.* 37, 526, which suggests a poetic word.

916–17 ἐπει | οὔδεις ἄν, ὅστις καὶ φίλος, τλαίη βλέπειν. 'since no one who loved him could bear to look on him.' For the thought cf. Eur. fr. 953m.33 *TrGF* φανερόν ὄμμα δυσπ[ρόσ]οπτον φίλοις ἐμοί τε ταλαίνα; contrast 923–4n. For καὶ 'following a relative (especially the universalizing ὅστις) . . . giv[ing] an effect of limitation, by imposing an additional qualification' see Denniston 295.

[918–19 φυσῶντ’ ἄνω πρὸς ῥίνας ἔκ τε φοινίας | πληγῆς μελανθὲν αἷμ’ ἄπ’ οἰκείας σφαγῆς.] ‘as he spurts blackened blood towards the nostrils and out of the bloody wound as a consequence of his self-inflicted slaughter.’ The deletion of these lines by Nauck^{3a} (‘aut depravati sunt aut ab Sophocle alieni’) is approved by West (1978a) 121, who compares *OR* 1278–9 as another ‘obvious interpolation in the interests of goriness’ (*Tr.* 781–2 may be a further example). As in the *Oedipus* passage, desire to supply an explicit direct object may have been an additional motive. Finglass (2009f) 335–7 points also to the obscurity of ἄπ’ οἰκείας σφαγῆς (my translation gives it an unsatisfyingly banal causal sense, but there is no better alternative).

For ‘black blood’ see 374–6n. For the blood of a dead or dying man streaming through the nostrils cf. Hom. *Od.* 22.18–19 αὐτίκα δ’ αὐλὸς ἀνὰ ῥίνας παχὺς ἦλθεν | αἷματος ἀνδρομέοιο. The noun ῥίς is not attested elsewhere in tragedy, though S. has it at fr. 171.2 *TrGF* in a satyr-play; we also find ῥινηλατέω at fr. 314.94 *TrGF* (satyr-play) and Aesch. *Ag.* 1185, and ῥινηλάτης at Tr. Adesp. fr. 426. In general ‘the tragedians of the fifth century are remarkably fastidious in their use of words to denote parts of the human body’ (Page on Eur. *Med.* 30–1, with examples); though they do occur, and so ῥίς is not further evidence against authenticity.

920 οἱμοι, τί δράσω; τίς σε βαστάσει φίλων; ‘Alas, what am I to do? Who among your friends will lift you?’ For the deliberative subjunctive followed by a future Radt (1985) 114–15 = (2002) 318–19 compares Eur. *El.* 967 τί δῆτα δρώμεν; μητέρ’ ἢ φονεύσομεν; *Ion* 758 εἴπωμεν ἢ σιγῶμεν ἢ τί δράσομεν; *IA* 442 οἱμοι, τί φῶ δύστηνος; ἄρξομαι πόθεν, Antiph. 1.4. In our passage and the one from *Electra* the subjunctive marks immediate *aporia*, the future an action which, though at the front of the speaker’s mind, is nevertheless not yet imminent (cf. Radt p. 115 = p. 317, though I hesitate to use his formulation ‘cooler [and] more distant’ of the future, and do not apply even my distinction to all his passages). We can thus reject the variant βαστάσῃ (perhaps an emendation aimed at ‘restoring’ a purely subjunctive verse).

921–2 ποῦ Τεῦκρος; ὥς ἀκμαῖ’ ἄν, εἰ βαίῃ, μόλοι, | πεπτώτ’ ἀδελφὸν τόνδε συγκαθαρμοῖσαι. ‘Where is Teucer? How timely he would arrive, if he did come, to join in composing his fallen brother here.’ Cf. Eur. *Alc.* 540 λυπούμενοις ὀχληρός, εἰ μόλοι, ξένος, Eur. *Hel.* [540] ὥς ποθεινὸς ἄν μόλοις. Wakefield (1790) 127 prints ἀκμαῖ’ ἄν for transmitted ἀκμαῖος; for the adverbial neuter plural with a verb of motion see 197–8n. Vauvilliers’s ἀκμήν ἄν (π 60, *prob.* Dawe, *STS* 1 157) also supplies ἄν with potential μόλοι, but adverbial ἀκμήν is not attested for tragedy. See further Finglass (2009f) 337. συγκαθαρμοῦζω (*hapax*) refers to purificatory rituals preceding the burial.

923–4 ὦ δῦσμορ' Αἴας, οἷος ὦν οἴως ἔχεις | ὥς καὶ παρ' ἐχθροῖς ἄξιος θρήνων τυχεῖν. 'O unhappy Ajax, what a man you are, and what a fate you endure! How worthy of receiving laments even in the eyes of your enemies!' A speech which began by limiting to Ajax's friends the prospect of sorrow at the sight of his corpse (915–17) ends by widening the circle of potential mourners to include even his enemies. The latter statement is more poignant and climactic in the light of the former. For 924 cf. *OR* 1295–6 θέαμα δ' εἰσόψη τάχα | τοιοῦτον οἶον καὶ στυγοῦντ' ἐποικτίσαι, fr. 659.8 *TrGF* φεῦ, κἄν ἀνοικτίρμων τις οἰκτίρειέ νιν, *Enn. Ann.* 162 Skutsch *cogebant hostes lacrimantes ut misererent*, *Ter. Hec.* 128–9, *Virg. Aen.* 2.6–8, 11.259 *vel Priamo miseranda manus*, *Ov. Met.* 6.276, 14.474, *Sen. Ag.* 521–2.

Most manuscripts attribute these lines to Tecmessa, although GR^{ac} give them to the chorus (*prob.* Dawe, *STS* 1 157). But the thematic link observed above between them and 916–17 makes it desirable that Tecmessa should deliver them all. It would have been easy to put the marginal abbreviation denoting the beginning of the chorus's part before 923 instead of 925/6, since 923 opens with a vocative such as often begins a new speaker's part. Cf. [969]–73n. for another incorrect attribution of Tecmessa's trimeters to the chorus. For the variant Αἴαν see 89–90n. For the apparent combination of vocative adjective with nominative noun see 641/2n.

For exclamations beginning οἷος see 367n. Polyptoton of οἷος (556–7n.) signals juxtaposition of greatness and wretchedness or a related contrast: cf. *Tr.* 1044–5 κλύουσ' ἔφριξα τάσδε συμφοράς, φίλοι, | ἄνακτος, οἴαις οἷος ὦν ἐλαύνεται, *El.* 751 οἷ' ἔργα δράσας οἷα λαγχάνει κακά, *Thuc.* 7.75.6 ἀπὸ οἷας λαμπρότητος καὶ αὐχήματος τοῦ πρώτου ἐξ οἷαν τελευτὴν καὶ ταπεινότητα ἀφίκτο, *Men. Asp.* 213–14 ὦ Τύχη, οἶω μ' ἄφ' οἷου δεσπότητος παρεγγυᾶν | μέλλεις, *Crinagoras A.P.* 9.284.1–2 = 1981–2 *GP* (of Corinth) οἷους ἀνθ' οἷων οἰκήτορας, ὦ ἐλεεινή, | εὖρσο ('the phrasing strikes a note of Tragic dignity': Gow and Page *ad loc.*). For παρά plus dative = 'in the eyes of' see 618–620/1n. (Dawe, *STS* 1 157–8, prefers 'apud' or 'chez'). The minority variant ἐχθρῶν is an easy error (or emendation) in this context, where the sense 'from' will have seemed appealing.

925/6–936 Tecmessa disappears behind the skene briefly to cover Ajax's body (915–16n.). She then accompanies her attendants as they bring it out (cf. *H/OK* (2007) 374). The new location of the body will be 'in a more forward, central position where it can serve as a focus for the following scenes and be fought over' (*ibid.*). The chorus's account of Ajax's responsibility for his own death thus accompanies the transfer of his body from the grove onto the stage.

925/6–928/9 ἐμελλες, τάλας, ἐμελλες χρόνων | στερεόφρων ἄρ' ἐξανύσσειν κακὰν | μοῖραν ἀπειρεσίων πόνων. 'You were fated, wretched man, you were fated, then, with your unbending mind to accomplish in the end a grim fate

of endless woes.’ ‘Fated’ is used loosely: the event has happened, so from one point of view it was always going to happen. The woes are ‘endless’ because of the continuing impact of the suicide on Ajax’s dependants.

For ἔμελλες . . . ἔμελλες at the start of successive dochmiacs see 348–349/50n.; for repetition in the same place in the strophe see 879/80–887/8n. For the sense of στερεόφρων (*hapax*) Jebb compares Pl. *Polit.* 309b, where τὸ στερεὸν ἦθος is associated with τὰς . . . ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνδρείαν μᾶλλον συντεινούσας (φύσεις); cf. Hesych. σ 1645 (p. 339 Hansen) στάσιμον ἦθος· βέβαιον, στερεόν. Even στερεός is not common in tragedy (attested at *Ant.* 1262/3, [Aesch.] *PV* 173, Eur. *Hel.* 854); found nine times in Homer, it is also standard in prose and so not specifically epic. For ἄρα ‘with μέλλειν and similar expressions, denoting that the predestination of an event is realised *ex post facto*’ see Denniston 36; compare the related use at 233–4 (n.).

Manuscripts divide between metrically guaranteed ἐξάνυσσιν and ἐξάνυσιν, with the single sigma expected in an Attic future. (The papyrus, according to Maehler (1984) 6, has room for twelve, not thirteen letters before]ακαν, and so read ἐξάνυσσιν.) Double sigma occurs in epic with this verb in this tense at Hom. *Od.* 16.373 ἀνύσσεσθαι (cf. also Diggle’s conjecture at Eur. *IT* 897); for the epic double sigma elsewhere in the play see 183–5n.

Epic ἀπειρέσιος is found once in elegy (Theogn. 8), twice in lyric (Stes. fr. 255 *PMGF*, Simon. fr. 274.1 Poltera), and nowhere else in tragedy.

928/9–933 τοῖά μοι | πάννυχα καὶ φαέθοντ’ ἀνεστέναζες ὠμόφρων | ἐχθοδόπ’ Ἀτρείδαις | οὐλίῳ σὺν πάθει. ‘Such were the groans of hatred that you made night and day, fierce of mind, against the Atreidae in your baneful suffering.’ Cf. the laments carried on day and night at *El.* 86–95. For τοῖά see 251/2–253/4n. πάννυχος, –ιος is confined to high poetry and Ionian prose (contrast παννυχίς, παννυχίζειν, which also occur in comedy). φαέθων is predicated of the sun in poetry (Hom. *Il.* 11.735 etc., Hes. *Th.* 760, Eur. *El.* 464–5, S. *El.* 824, Alex. Aet. fr. 1.1 Magnelli); the participle provides a more striking expression than e.g. πανημέριος, and the preceding parallel adjective makes its sense clear (thus Jebb). For the possibility that a word has dropped out after φαέθοντ’ see 879/80–887/8n.

The variant ἄρ’ ἐστέναζες looks like an emendation aimed at importing yet another ἄρα (cf. 926/7, 934). For ὠμός applied to Ajax see 205–7n. ἐχθοδοπός is attested in classical literature at *Phil.* 1137 (lyr.), Hom. *Il.* 1.518, Ar. *Ach.* 226/8 (lyr.), Pl. Com. fr. 220 *PCG*, and Pl. *Leg.* 810d. The formation –δ–απός derives from IE **-nkwos*, cognate with Latin *-nquus* (cf. Leumann (1950) 158–9 n. 1). For οὔλιος (and ὀλοός) in tragedy see 401a–402n.

934–6 μέγας ἄρ’ ἦν ἐκεῖνος ἄρχων χρόνος | πημάτων, ἦμος ἀριστόχειρ | <— — —> ὀπλων ἐκεῖτ’ ἀγών πέρι. ‘So that time was the potent source of sorrows [Jebb], when a contest of valour was established for the [...]

arms.’ For the ‘beginning of evil’ see 282n. For μέγας ἄρ’ ἦν ἐκείνος ἄρχων cf. Hdt. 9.91.1 πολλὸς ἦν λισσόμενος. For ἄρα see 925/6–928/gn. ἦμος (Doric ἄμος) in classical Greek is confined to high poetry and Ionic prose. In tragedy Aeschylus never uses it; Euripides has it once, in lyric (*Hec.* 915); elsewhere in S. it occurs in trimeters (*Tr.* 155, 531, *OR* 1134).

ἀριστόχειρ . . . ἄγων ‘valorous contest’, standing for ‘contest of valour’, is an involved expression similar to *El.* 698–9 ἱππικῶν | . . . ὠκύπους ἄγων, *OC* 1062–3 ῥιμφορμάτοις | φεύγοντες ἀμίλλαις; Bers (1974) 73 cites more examples. Wunderl writes ἄγων, but ‘the contest of valour’ gives the wrong emphasis. The change gives exact responsion, but this syllable is anceps.

Responsion reveals a missing choriamb at the start of 936 (as Triclinius p. 350.18–20 Dindorf identifies, although his supplement Ἀχιλλέως is unmetrical); even without the strophic test, bare ὅπλων denoting the arms of Achilles is suspicious. Possible supplements include χρυσοστύπων (Campbell; used of Achilles’ helmet at Eur. *El.* 470), χρυσοδέτων (Musgrave; of Rhesus’ armour at [Eur.] *Rhes.* 383, of a sword-hilt at Alcaeus fr. 350.1–2 Voigt), οὐλομένων (Thiersch *teste* Schneidewin²; used by Odysseus of the arms at Hom. *Od.* 11.554–5), ἀθανάτων (MLW, comparing ἀμβροτα τεύχεα at *Il.* 17.194) and ἐν Δαναοῖς (Elmsley (1814) 471; but this leaves ὅπλων unqualified). There is no way of deciding between the first three.

For κέῖται predicated of ἄγων cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 665, Diotimus *A.P.* 9.391.3 = 1761 *HE*; also ἄγωνά τιθῆμι at *Alc.* 1026, Hdt. 2.91.4. περί is standard with ἄγων denoting the prize of a contest (cf. Hdt. 8.15.2, Thuc. 7.61.1, Dem. 57.45; at Eur. *Or.* 491 (corrupt), Ar. *Nub.* 955–8 for the nature of the contest).

937, 939 ἰὼ μοῖ μοι. For the single ἰὼ see 891n.

938 χωρεῖ πρὸς ἥπαρ, οἶδα, γενναία δύη. ‘True pain goes to the heart, I know.’ For the liver touched by pain or grief (where we speak of the heart) cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 432, 971 δῆγμα δὲ λύπης οὐδὲν ἐφ’ ἥπαρ προσικνεῖται, Eur. *Hipp.* 1070, Onians (1954) 84–7, Padel (1992) 19 with n. 28. γενναία δύη is ‘a sorrow which has kept to the full all the characteristic signs of sorrow’ (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1198), the basic sense of the adjective being ‘that which remains within its nature and type, the genuine’ (*ibid.*). The scholia prefer ‘strong’ (ἰσχυρά, p. 207 Chr.), which is further from the basic sense of the adjective, and gives less interesting sense.

940–1 οὐδὲν σ’ ἄπιστῶ καὶ δις οἰμῶξαι, γύναι, | τοιοῦδ’ ἀποβλαφθεῖσαν ἄρτιως φίλου. ‘I am not surprised that you should cry out even twice, lady, bereft as you now are of such a loved one.’ For the force of δις see 432[–3]n. οἰμῶξαι picks up the preceding cry (see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1401). ἀποβλάπτω (elsewhere attested at Pind. *N.* 7.60 and Pl. *Leg.* 795d, and so probably poetic) suggests external force more vividly than e.g. στερηθεῖσαν

would have (cf. Bruhn §23.1, p. 16), perhaps even divine agency (455–6n.). It takes the genitive of separation, as commonly with βλάπτω (in tragedy only at Aesch. *Ag.* 120 and *Sept.* 784 (*coni.*: see Hutchinson)).

Instead of ἀρτίως L^sH have –ίου (*prob.* Bergk (1848) 151). Some claim that this reading is implied by the scholia (p. 207 Chr.: γνησίου· οὐ γάρ ἐστι χρονικόν) and *Suda* (α 4045 = 1369.17–19 Adler: ἀρτίως· . . . ἀντὶ τοῦ γνησίου· τοιοῦδ' ἀποβλαφθεὶς ἀρτίως φίλου), but Schneidewin (1848b) plausibly argues that these glosses indicate that they took ἀρτίως in the sense of τελείως, and so do not constitute further evidence for the variant. ἀρτίος is attested elsewhere in tragedy only at Eur. *Tro.* 417 οὐ . . . ἀρτίας ἔχεις φρένας, against dozens of instances of ἀρτίως; the sense it would give here ('such a perfect loved one') has a strange emphasis. More likely it is a corruption encouraged by the surrounding genitives in –ου.

942 σοὶ μὲν δοκεῖν ταῦτ' ἔστ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἄγαν φρονεῖν. 'It is for you to imagine this, but for me to realise it all too powerfully.' The emphatic opposition (climactically repeated at 972–3; cf. [1038–9n.]) marks the special intensity of Tecmessa's grief. Furthermore, her 'expression of social ties, . . . along with the chorus' tentative support of that expression, establish her status at the crucial moment of Ajax's death' (Ormand (1996) 56 ≈ (1999) 118, citing Alexiou (2002) 20); that is, her status as a wife, which gives her the particular right to lament over her husband. For ἄγαν see 354–5n. For φρονέω 'realise, understand' see 554–5n.

943 ξυναυδῶ. 'I agree.'

944–5 οἶμοι, τέκνον, πρὸς οἷα δουλείας ζυγὰ | χωροῦμεν, οἷοι νῶν ἐφεστᾶσι σκοποῖ. 'Oimoi, my child, to what yokes of slavery we are travelling, what overseers are set over us!' In her anxiety Tecmessa speaks as if already at an advanced stage in the process of enslavement. An alternative rendering gives οἷοι a causal sense (' . . . such are the overseers who are . . .'; for this use of οἷος see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 105, K–G II 370–1). But the audience would assume that οἷα and οἷοι mean the same unless this were obviously unattractive.

οἶμοι, τέκνον is a specifically tragic lament (A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 754–5). The 'yoke of slavery' is a mainly tragic image: cf. fr. 591.5–6 *TrGF*, Aesch. *Pers.* 50 with Garvie, *Sept.* 75, 471, 793, *Ag.* 953, [1226], [Aesch.] *PV* 463, Eur. *Andr.* 301–2, *Tro.* 600, 678, Hdt. 7.8γ3, Pl. *Leg.* 770e, Schrekenberg (1964) 20.

946–8 ᾧμοι, ἀναλγήτων | δισῶν ἐθρόησας ἄναυδ' ἔργ' Ἀτρειδᾶν τῷδ' ἄχει. 'Oimoi, in this cry of pain you proclaimed the unspeakable deeds of the two ruthless Atridae.' For the orthography of ᾧμοι see 227/8–232n. The variant ἰώ μοι may be a trace of a common corruption (372–3n.). Predicating ἀναλγήτων of the Atridae emphasises that Tecmessa's claim at 923–4 does

not apply to them. For ἄχος meaning not ‘pain’ but ‘cry of pain’ cf. *OC* 1722 λήγετε τοῦδ’ ἄχους; similarly, οἰκτος ‘pity’ can mean ‘piteous cry’ (e.g. 895).

I justify Hermann’s ἀναυδ’ ἔργ’ for transmitted ἀναυδον ἔργον at 901–2n. ἀναυδον is literally ‘voiceless’, and consequently ‘for which (for describing which) there is no speech, no means of expression’ (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 238).

949 ἀλλ’ ἀπειργοί θεός. ‘But may a god avert it!’ For the apotropaic prayer see 186–7n.

950 οὐκ ἂν τάδ’ ἔσται τῇδε μὴ θεῶν μέτα. ‘These things would not stand like this without the gods.’ Tecmessa rejects the conventional prayer with bitter realism. For the double negative expressing divine agency cf. 766–9n. For τάδ’ . . . τῇδε cf. *Ant.* 722 φιλεῖ γὰρ τοῦτο μὴ ταύτη ῥέπειν, Page on Eur. *Med.* 365, Ennius 225 Jocelyn *nequaquam istuc istac ibit*, Gygli-Wyss (1966) 27 with n. 4, Collard (2005a) 373. For the slight compression in the verbless μὴ-clause cf. *OR* 1456–7 οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε | θνήσκων ἐσώθην, μὴ ἰτί τῷ δεινῷ κακῷ, Eur. *Phoen.* 526 οὐκ εὖ λέγειν χρὴ μὴ ἰτί τοῖς ἔργοις καλοῖς.

951 ἄγαν ὑπερβριθὲς <υ> ἄχθος ἦνυσαν. ‘Too heavy indeed was the burden they contrived.’ For ‘excessive’ divine punishment cf. Eur. *Ba.* 1249–50 ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἐνδίκως μὲν ἀλλ’ ἄγαν | Βρόμιος ἀναξ ἀπώλεσ’ οἰκεῖος γεγώς (although there Cadmus acknowledges that the punishment was just, unlike the chorus here). For ἄγαν see 354–5n. For the emphatic pleonasm ἄγαν ὑπερ– Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 378 cites e.g. *Pers.* 794 τοὺς ὑπερπόλλους ἄγαν, 827 τῶν ὑπερκόμπων ἄγαν; add *Eum.* 824 ὑπερθύμως ἄγαν, Eur. *Held.* 388 τῶν ἄγαν ὑπερφρόνων, Tr. Adesp. fr. 521 *TrGF*. ὑπερβριθής is not found again until the Byzantine period, but ἐμβριθής is classical (in tragedy at fr. 757.3 *TrGF*, Aesch. *Pers.* 693, Tr. Adesp. fr. 328k, and in prose); for this suffix elsewhere in tragedy cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 965 ἐπιβριθής, fr. 338 ὀπισθοβριθής, Eur. *Suppl.* 1125 ἄβριθής, fr. 531 σιδηροβριθής, Tr. Adesp. fr. 264 σαυροβριθής.

The line needs an extra syllable after ὑπερβριθὲς to correspond with 905 (n.). Possible supplements, none obviously superior, include γάρ (Elmsley), τόδ’ (Brunck), and γε τᾶχθος (Blaydes!). The reading τε ἄχθος in **r** is probably a (metrically deficient) attempt to create a full trimeter rather than a trace of original γε τᾶχθος. Triclinius’s καὶ μὴν ἄγαν removes emphatic initial ἄγαν.

ἄγαν is followed by γ’ in several manuscripts, and by δ’ in A; the papyrus probably had one or other of these, given the size of the gap at the beginning of the line (thus Maehler (1984) 6). But from at least the time of Palladas in the 4th c. AD (Wilkinson (2009)), ἄγαν was scanned with two short syllables, and this often prompted metrical interpolation of γε (cf. *OR* 439, Tr. 1182, *OC* 1264, Fraenkel’s edition of Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*, III 574 n. 1, Zuntz (1965) 208–9, Diggle (1991) 101). The papyrus is dated to the fifth or sixth century AD, and so

fits this chronology. Hence the corruption does not result from displacement of γε from later in the line, and so does not support Blaydes's emendation there. Nor was γε added to provide a link with the preceding line, since it is not a connector. A's reading will be either a further corruption from interpolated γε or an independent metrical emendation (see J. Jackson (1955) 42–4 for such interventions in that manuscript).

The need for a third person plural after θεῶν in 950 rules out minority variants ἦνυσεν and –ας.

952–3 τοιόνδε μέντοι Ζηνὸς ἡ δεινὴ θεὸς | Παλλὰς φυτεύει πῆμ' Ὀδυσσεώς χάριν. 'Such indeed is the woe that the dread goddess, the daughter of Zeus, even Pallas, has contrived as a favour for Odysseus.' Tecmessa's formulation is 'an embittered distortion: Athena was indeed at work, but unless we are to disbelieve Calchas (756–77) mere favouritism for Odysseus was not her motive' (R. Parker (1999) 15; the 'distortion' is from the audience's point of view, however, since Tecmessa did not hear the Messenger's speech, and thus her hypothesis is plausible given her state of knowledge). Odysseus is also blamed for Ajax's death at *DAGM* §17 δι' Ὀδυσ<σ>έα τὸν ἀλιτρόν. The elaborate description of Athena emphasises her power (cf. 450–3).

For emphatic μέντοι after a demonstrative cf. 1246, 1358, Denniston 399–400. Jebb takes the particle as corrective ("yet," – crushing though the sorrow is'), supposing an untragic expectation that intense suffering would not normally have a divine origin. For the bare genitive Ζηνὸς denoting paternity see 172–5n. For φυτεύει πῆμ' cf. *Eleg. Adesp.* fr. 61.4 *IEG* πῆμ' ἐφύτ[ευσε] [*suppl.* Lobel]; also the similar use of τίκτω (see Diggle on Eur. *Pha.* 93).

954/5–956 ἢ ῥα κελαινῶπαν θυμὸν ἐφυβρίζει | πολύτλας ἀνὴρ 'Indeed he makes mockery in his dark soul, the much-enduring man'. The chorus ironically juxtapose one of Odysseus' most laudatory epithets (cf. Hom. *Il.* 8.97, *Od.* 5.171, Worman (2008) 168–9 n. 52) with a vivid expression of his villainy; thanks to him, his enemies have much to endure. For ἢ ῥα see 172–5n. κελαινῶπαν θυμὸν (probably also in the papyrus's]ελαινωπαν[: cf. Maehler (1984) 6) is an accusative of respect (Moorhouse 43), for which Jebb compares *Ant.* 1095 παράσσομαι φρένας and Hom. *Il.* 8.559 γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα ποιμήν; add perhaps 558–9 (n.). The black θυμός denotes evil, as at Aesch. *Eum.* 459 κελαινόφρων (Orestes on Clytemnestra); for this colour predicated of the θυμός, φρένες, etc. see further Diggle (1969) 39 = (1994) 10, Jocelyn (1970) 42, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 785, Padel (1992) 68–9 n. 68, Sullivan (1997) 55–6, 130–1, Garvie on Aesch. *Pers.* 115–19.

κελαινώπης is not attested elsewhere, but Pindar has κελαινώψ (*P.* 4.212) and κελαινώπις (*P.* 1.7). The variant –ῶπα –ον (cf. Hesychius κ 2137 = π 457 Latte κελαινώπα θυμὸν [Alberti: κελαινοπάθιμον cod.])· τὸν μὴ φανερόν. τὸν δόλιον. καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ δύσνον) reflects confusion between adjectives in –ώψ

and –ώπης. Ll-J/W conjecture κελαινῶπα θυμῷ (κελαινώπη *iam* Wesseling (1751) 137), disliking the accusative of respect, and believing that the minority variant is a trace of an original dative. Neither claim is cogent, as this note should demonstrate.

πολύτλας (*coni.* Porson on Eur. *Or.* 1297) is in WaWb (unmetrical ὁ πολύτλας appears elsewhere, including probably Π⁴, which according to Maehler (1984) 6 has space for five letters before]τλας). For the error see 205–7n.

957–8 γελᾷ δὲ τοῖσδε μαινομένοις ἄχεσιν | πολλὸν γέλωτα, φεῦ φεῦ ‘He laughs loudly at these frenzied sufferings, *pheu pheu*’. The laughter of enemies causes special distress (367n.). For the internal accusative γελᾷ . . . πολλὸν γέλωτα (often, as here, with an adjective) see Moorhouse 39. τοῖσδε (*coni.* Elmsley (1814) 472) for manuscript τοῖς restores respension. The demonstrative is preferable to τοῖσι (Triclinius) in a reference to the chorus’s own pain. μαινομένοις ἄχεσιν stresses the intensity of the chorus’s grief, as well as producing a grim circularity: the suicide of Ajax, partly the consequence of μανία, has resulted in suffering which can be represented in those same terms.

959–60 ξύν τε διπλοῖ βασιλῆς | κλύοντες Ἀτρεΐδαι. ‘and together with him the twin kings, the Atidae, as they listen.’ The laughter previously confined to Odysseus’ dark soul (954/5) has become something that others can hear and share in (cf. Halliwell (2008) 90–1 n. 95). For adverbial ξύν cf. 1288, *El.* 299, Bruhn §64.3. βασιλῆς is owed to Livineius ‘p’ (Par. gr. 2820 has –ῆς); for the orthography see 188–90n.

961–2 οἱ δ’ οὖν γελόντων κάπιχαίροντων κακοῖς | τοῖς τοῦδ’ ‘Well, let them laugh and rejoice in this man’s afflictions!’ The ‘defiant ironical imperative’ (Headlam on Herodas 1.19; cf. 971) is strengthened by contemptuous οἱ δ’ οὖν (114–15n.). The minority variant αὖ gives inappropriate sense (‘in turn’) and weaker force; for a similar corruption cf. 871n.

Hermann² restores οἱ δ’ οὖν for manuscript οἱδ’ οὖν. In his note on Ar. *Ach.* 185 (vol. 1 p. 481), Bergler cites our line beginning οἱ δ’ οὖν. But his translation ‘illi igitur ridento’, as well as the acute accent on the iota, suggest that the space between iota and delta is a printer’s error.

962–3 ἴσως τοι, κεί βλέποντα μὴ ᾗθουν, | θανόντ’ ἂν οἰμώξειαν ἐν χρεῖα δορός. ‘Even if they did not miss him while he lived, perhaps now that he is dead they may lament him in the urgency of battle’ (Lloyd-Jones, adapted). ‘It was a commonplace that one resented the successful in their lifetime and only appreciated them when they were dead’ (Nisbet and Rudd on Hor. *C.* 3.24.31–2, with examples; cf. e.g. [Mimnermus] fr. 25 *IEG*). The same idea lies behind Achilles’ vaunts ἦ ποτ’ Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἴζεται νῆας Ἀχαιῶν | σύμπαντας (Hom. *Il.* 1.240–1) and νῦν οἶω περὶ γούνατ’ ἐμὰ στήσεσθαι Ἀχαιοὺς | λισσομένους· χρεῖά γάρ ἰκάνεται οὐκέτ’ ἀνεκτός (11.609–10).

For βλέπω ‘I am alive’ see 1067, Davies on *Tr.* 828, West (2007) 86–7, LSJ⁹ s.v. III 2. The general sense allows ποθέω in the protasis, where strict logic would require a verb meaning ‘appreciate’: ‘they will miss him now, even if before they did not’. Understated ἴσως strengthens the potential optative (cf. Nuchelmans (1976) 232–3), as does τοι (cf. Denniston 544). For καὶ εἰ introducing an admitted fact see 562–4n. For ἐν χρεῖα δορός cf. *OR* 1442–3 ἴν’ ἔσταμεν | χρεῖας ἄμεινον ἐκμαθεῖν τί δραστέον, Aesch. *Sept.* 506 ἐν χρεῖα τύχης.

964–5 οἱ γὰρ κακοὶ γνῶμασι τὰγαθὸν χεροῖν | ἔχοντες οὐκ ἴσασι πρὶν τις ἐκβάλῃ. ‘For fools do not realise that they have what is good in their hands until they lose it.’ The thought generalises and expands the previous statement: cf. Plaut. *Capl.* 142–3 *tum denique homines nostra intellegimus bona*, | *quom quae in potestate habuimus ea amisimus*, Liban. *Ep.* 1470 (XI 501.11–12 Foerster) κείμενον ἐν χεροῖν ἀγαθὸν οὐκ εἰδώς, ὃ γνῶσεται ἀπελθόν (referring to S.); also Pl. *Resp.* 432d οἱ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἔχοντες ζητοῦσιν ἐνίοτε ὃ ἔχουσιν. For the dative γνῶμασι cf. Kannicht on Eur. fr. 525.3 *TrGF* βελτίονα . . . σώμασιν τέκνα, K–G I 317 Anm. 19 and 440 (12). For the generic sense of τὰγαθὸν see Moorhouse 148–9. Collective τις (417/18n.) follows the plural οἱ κακοὶ as at *Tr.* 2–3 οὐκ ἂν αἰῶν’ ἐκμάθοις βροτῶν, πρὶν ἂν | θάνῃ τις. Grammatically it could refer to a third party, but the sense is better if ‘the loss [is] due solely to the folly of the possessors themselves’ (Jebb). For ἐκβάλῃ ‘I lose’ cf. *OR* 611, *Ant.* 649.

τὰγάθ’ ἐν, found in the Jena group (cf. Turyn (1952) 91, 94), is conjectured by Reiske (1753) 7. It brings no advantages, as both the singular abstract and χεροῖν without ἐν are paralleled in S. Of the two alternatives, the Jena reading is more likely to result from corruption: a gloss ἐν on χεροῖν could have entered the text (28n.), either displacing part of the original line (as in the Jena text) or not (as in Q’s τὰγαθὸν ἐν).

[966–70] Nauck^{5a} deletes these lines, a decision which Finglass (2009f) 338–46 supports on metrical and linguistic grounds. The following notes summarise my case. For other, limited deletions which partly anticipate Nauck see *ibid.* 345 n. 47.

[966–7] ἔμοι πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἢ κείνοις γλυκὺς, | αὐτῷ δὲ τερπνός:] ‘His death is bitter to me than sweet to them, but was a delight to him.’ The asyndeton is unsophoclean, and the meaning nonsense: ἢ cannot mean μᾶλλον ἢ ‘rather than’ if unaccompanied by a verb such as βούλομαι in which ‘the idea of preference is implicit’ (Pearson (1919) 122). Eustathius 1521.41–2 (I 197.7–9 Stallbaum) and the *Suda* γ 284 (I 526.27–8 Adler) originally read ἦ, as noticed by Schneidewin (1849) 472–3 (cf. Pearson (1919) 123). This would mean ‘His death is a sorrow to me in the same manner as it is a source of joy for them’, a tortured expression rightly rejected by Dawe, *STS* I 161.

[967–8 ὦν γὰρ ἡράσθη τυχεῖν | ἐκτήσαθ' αὐτῷ, θάνατον δυνπερ ἤθελεν.] ‘For he obtained for himself what he desired to gain, the death which he wanted.’ For pleasure in achieving one’s desires cf. fr. 356.2–3 *ΤῖGF ἡδιστον δ’ ὅτω | πάρεστι λήψις ὦν ἐρᾷ καθ’ ἡμέραν*, Theogn. 256 *πρᾶγμα δὲ τερπνότατον, τοῦ τις ἐρᾷ, τὸ τυχεῖν*; for death as the object of such a desire cf. *OC* 1704–5 (Χο.) *ἔπραξεν— (Αν.) ἔπραξεν οἶον ἤθελεν. | (Χο.) τὸ ποῖον; (Αν.) ἄς ἐχρηζέ γὰς ἐπὶ ξένας | ἔθανε*. For ἐράω of strong non-sexual desire see 684–6n. For the emphatic relative see Moorhouse 263 (‘the death, and none other, for which he wished’).

[969]–973 Several manuscripts attribute these lines to the chorus, but the thought is continuous between 968 and 969, and ἐμοί in 972 must refer to Tecmessa.

[969 τί δῆτα τοῦδ’ ἐπεγγεῖν ἄν κάτα;] ‘Why, then, should they laugh at him?’ A single word takes up the whole of the second metron (and the first half of the third, since ἄν goes closely with it); there is no secure parallel for the absence of caesura. Both obvious remedies (τοῦδ’ γ’ ἐγγεῖν Porson, in his second edition of Euripides’ *Hecuba*, p. xxviii, and τοῦδ’ ἐτ’ Meineke (1863) 284) introduce a word with the wrong force in this context. The compound verb together with κάτα, and the gap between κάτα in anastrophe and its pronoun, are not suspicious (Finglass (2009f) 341 gives parallels).

The minority variant πῶς for τί is ‘presumably a gloss in origin to indicate that τί did not mean “what”’ (Dawe, *STS* 1 161; cf. 28n.). For δῆτα in questions see 42n.

[970 θεοῖς τέθνηκεν οὔτος, οὐ κείνοισιν, οὔ.] ‘It is the gods that killed him, not they, no!’ (Lloyd-Jones). Finglass (2009f) 342–3 discusses the datives; cf. in particular *El.* 1152 (Electra, addressing the supposed ashes of Orestes) *τέθνηκ’ ἐγὼ σοί* ‘I have been killed by you’, Eur. *Andr.* 334 (Andromache to Menelaus) *τέθνηκα τῇ σῇ θυγατρὶ καὶ μ’ ἀπώλεσεν*. See Finglass (2009f) 343 n. 38 for the repeated, isolated negative οὔ. But while the syntax is unexceptional, the sense is not: for ‘the other Greeks are not laughing at Ajax because they imagine they have killed him themselves’ (Reeve (1973) 161).

971–3 The deletion of these lines by Schöll (his translation, pp. 161–2, n. *) is approved by Taplin (1977) 385 n. 1 and Raeburn. Their sole reason is the alleged need to secure responsion with 915–24; the lines contain no problems of sense, language, or metre. Since Nauck’s excisions of 918–19 and 966–70 achieve responsion as a by-product of removing lines with several such problems, the removal of 971–3 becomes moot.

971 πρὸς ταῦτ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν κenoῖς ὑβριζέτω. ‘In the face of that let Odysseus abuse the bereaved with contempt!’ For minatory πρὸς ταῦτα prefacing an

imperative cf. 1066, 1115, 1313, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 249, *El.* 383n. For similar statements of defiance see 961–2n. This sense of ἐν κenoῖς is owed to Lobel *ap.* Lloyd-Jones (1971) 344–5 = (1990a) 457), who translates ‘at the expense of us who are left unprotected’ (anon. *ap.* Pearson (1922) 127 n. 1 previously suggested ‘against those that are helpless’). For ἐν see 43n. The phrase is usually translated ‘vainly’ or similar, but the sole parallel cited for ἐν with plural adjective used as an adverb is *OR* 287 ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν ἀργοῖς οὐδὲ τοῦτ’ ἐπραξάμην, which can be translated ‘I saw to it that not even this act should be among things neglected.’

972–3 Αἴας γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ’ ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ ἐμοὶ | λιπὼν ἀνίας καὶ γόους
 διοίχεται. ‘For Ajax is for them no more, while for me he has left pain and
 lamentation by his death.’ For the second part of the statement cf. 1005 (n.), *Ti.*
 41–2 ἐμοὶ πικρὰς | ὠδίνας αὐτοῦ προσβαλὼν ἀποίχεται, Eur. *Suppl.* 1156 ἄχη
 ματρὶ . . . ἔλειπεν, Hom. *Od.* 14.137–8 ὥς ὁ μὲν ἐνθ’ ἀπόλωλε, φίλοισι δὲ κῆδε’
 ὀπίσσω | πᾶσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα, τετεύχεται, *Il.* 22.482–4, 24.725–6, Solon fr.
 21 *IEG* μηδέ μοι ἄκλαυτος θάνατος μόλοι, ἀλλὰ φίλοισι | καλλείποιμι θανὼν
 ἄλγεα καὶ στοναχάς, Diodorus *A.P.* 6.348.4–5 = 2181–2 *GP* θαλερὴν κλαῖεν
 Ἀθηναῖδα | Λεσβιάδεσσιν ἄχος καὶ Ἰήσωνι πατρὶ λιποῦσαν, Andronicus *A.P.*
 7.181.1–2 = 29–30 *FGE* δόμον ἦλυθες εἰς Ἀχέρωντος | . . . φίλα ματρὶ λιποῦσα
 γόους with Page, Alexiou (2002) 182–3, *IGSK* xviπ/1 500.5 οἷς [i.e. the family
 of the dead man] κὲ πένθος ἄπαυστον ἐγὼ λίπον.

αὐτοῖς denotes the bereaved mentioned in 971; this part of the statement explains why they are bereaved. The ἀλλά clause highlights as a climax the special agony undergone by Tecmessa herself (cf. 942). Usually αὐτοῖς is taken to refer to Ajax’s enemies, picking up κείνοισιν in 970, but then the force of the dative is obscure, as is the nature of the opposition with ἐμοί.

Tecmessa’s spoken part ends here. Her continued presence on stage (except between 989 and 1168) is a reminder of what Teucer must struggle to protect: not just the rights of the dead man, but the safety of his wife and child. According to Ormand (1996) 57, her silence denotes that she is ‘follow<ing> the rules of propriety that seem to have regulated the lives of Athenian citizen-women’, now she has established her status as Ajax’s widow (942n.). But if Tecmessa’s silence was to have this significance, we might have expected attention to be drawn to it in some way.

FOURTH EPISODE (974–1184)

974–1027 As if in answer to prayers from Ajax (826–30, 998–9) and Tecmessa (921–2), Teucer arrives before Ajax’s enemies can maltreat his corpse. The audience’s initial impression of him is favourable (cf. M. Heath (1987) 198). His distress at his brother’s death (977–83) swiftly yields to perceptive concern for the most vulnerable member of the household (983–9). Like Tecmessa, who

sent out the expedition to rescue Ajax in response to the Messenger's news (803–11), Teucer quickly dispatches a party to come to the aid of Eurysaces. In other ways his language echoes Tecmessa's (974n., 1004n., 1005n.), while his uncovering of the body is the next stage in the process of lamentation begun by her concealment (1003n.). Teucer as it were takes over from Tecmessa the position of Ajax's chief mourner and defender; continuity in language and action emphasises that he is a worthy successor.

The rapid exchange of 974–91 is followed by a lengthy lament over the body in the grand style (992–1027). The removal of the covering, and the extrametrical οἴμοι (1002–3), constitute the fulcrum of the speech: the dead body itself, in all its horror. Before the uncovering, Teucer describes the dreadful rumour which led him to this sight (992–1001); after it, he considers the future consequences of the suicide (1004–23). Like the chorus and Tecmessa (900–2, 944–5), Teucer is concerned with the impact of the death on himself, both in Salamis on his return (1008–21), and at Troy (1021–3); again, this is a tribute to the centrality of Ajax to his life, not a self-centred diatribe. He spends much longer on Salamis. This makes sense in dramatic terms, since the consequences at Troy are about to be played out on stage. The concentration on Telamon's angry reaction to his son's return (for which cf. probably S.'s *Teucer*, Eur. *Hel.* 83–106, Pacuvius, *Teucer*, Hor. *C.* 1.7.21–32) also sets Teucer in parallel to Ajax, who feared a similarly antagonistic reception (460–6). This magnifies Teucer by the association, and brings into question Ajax's decision to kill himself: he appears to have merely transferred his problem to his half-brother. Teucer ends by returning to the body in front of him, probably moving close to it to lift it from the sword (1024–7). Unlike the preceding epirrhematic dialogue, his speech does not include a consideration of why Ajax killed himself. This is partly because Ajax's past is about to be the subject of two fierce debates, and so could not be discussed here without excessive repetition; partly because Teucer has only just returned and cannot be cognisant of the events of the past few hours; and partly because Teucer, the doughty defender of Ajax, never shows awareness of any factors which could complicate his view of him. When the attack comes, it will be met by a champion completely convinced of Ajax's righteousness.

974 ἰὼ μοί μοι. Teucer cries out as he walks up eisodos A with at least one attendant (1003n.) and sees the covered corpse next to Tecmessa. His lament succeeds her reference to her ἀνῖα καὶ γόοι, marking the transition which this entry represents; the same cry announced Tecmessa's discovery of the body (891). Since the chorus do not see him at 975–6, he does not arrive on stage until 977.

According to H/OK (2007) 374, Teucer 'need not be crying out in response to any particular sight or sound: the distressing news he has been told would

be enough'; they argue that 'he does not initially see the corpse', because '977–8 is still dependent on rumour, and asks a question'. The former claim assumes that he has been exclaiming *ἰὼ μοί μοι* since hearing the rumour, and now utters this cry independently of the nearby scene which would provide a more obvious motivation for it. Members of the audience who made this assumption would have to abandon it at 1000–1, where *ὑπεστέναζον* describes Teucer's expressions of grief after hearing the rumour but before seeing the body; this verb cannot denote a loud cry (976 *βοῶντος* . . . *μέλος*) heard from a distance (321–2n.). As for 977–8, see n.

975–6 *σίγησον· αὐδὴν γὰρ δοκῶ Τεύκρου κλύειν | βοῶντος ἄτης τῆσδ' ἐπίσκοπον μέλος*. 'Be silent! For I think I hear the voice of Teucer, crying out a song that hits the mark of this disaster' (cf. Raeburn). The chorus have not yet caught sight of Teucer. Requests for silence often anticipate arrivals (specific individuals at *El.* 324–7, *Phil.* 201/2–217/18, *Eur. IT* 456–8, 723–4, *Or.* [1367–9]); 'someone' at *El.* 1322–3, *Eur. Or.* 1311–12).

μέλος denotes a loud, unmusical sound at fr. 699 *TrGF* *μέλη βοῶν ἀναυλα καὶ ῥακτήρια* (with Pearson), *Eur. El.* 756 *μέλος βοῆς* (of a *φόνιος οἰμωγή*, 752), *Ar. Av.* 1095–6 *δξύ μέλος* [Brunck: *δξύβελής* vel *–μελής* codd.] *ἀχέτας* . . . *βοᾷ*.

ἐπίσκοπον derives from *σκοπός* 'target', as at Aesch. *Eum.* 902–3 (Χο.) *τί οὐν μ' ἀνωγας τῆδ' ἐφθυμῆσαι χθονί; | (Αθ.) ὁποῖα νίκης μὴ κακῆς ἐπίσκοπα* (cf. Hesych. ε 5186 = π 170 Latte *ἐπίσκοπα· τυγχάνοντα τοῦ σκοποῦ*); the song is a missile, its subject the target, as often in Pindar (cf. *N.* 6.26–9 *ἐλπομαι | μέγα εἰπὼν σκοποῦ ἄντα τυχεῖν | ὧτ' ἀπὸ τόξου ἰείς· εὐθὺν' ἐπὶ τοῦτον, ἄγε, Μοῖσα, | οὖρον ἐπέων | εὐκλέα* with Gerber, 9.55 *ἀκοντίζων σκοποῖ' ἄγχιστα Μοισᾶν*, *O.* 9.5–14, Simpson (1969) 449–58, West (2007) 45; for arrows associated with poetry see S. R. West on Hom. *Od.* 1.122). Hermann's preferred meaning (*ἐπιμελητικόν*, 'concerned with'; cf. *ἐπίσκοπος* 'overseer') is weak by comparison.

Teucer arrives on stage.

977–8 *ὦ φίλτατ' Αἴας, ὦ ξύναιμον ὄμ' ἐμοί, | ἄρ' ἡμπόληκας ὥσπερ ἡ φάτις κρατεῖ*; 'O dearest Ajax, o bright source of brotherly joy, have you fared as the rumour prevails?' The tableau before Teucer is plain enough; his question is partly a request for confirmation of what he dreads, partly an appalled expression of despair (see Davies's commentary on *Trachiniae*, Index s.v. style, question as exclamation). Yet 'in his grief <he> pays no attention to Tekmessa or the chorus' (Mastronarde (1979) 22), directing his question instead to the absent Ajax, whose body, he infers, is lying before him, still covered. His address is thus strictly illogical, but emotionally and rhetorically satisfying. The heightened emotion is marked by repeated *ὦ* (cf. *El.* 1354 *ὦ φίλτατον φῶς, ὦ μόνος σωτὴρ δόμων*, perhaps *Eur.* fr. 727a.98 *TrGF* *ὦ* *φίλτατ'*, *ὦ*.).

The translation of ὦ ξύναιμον ὅμ’ ἐμοί is owed to Stanford (similarly Campbell, Long (1968) 124–5, Lloyd-Jones (1993) 303 = (2005) 113). This use of ὅμμα (191/2–192/3n.) balances and develops φίλτατε in the previous address. The basic sense of ὅμμα, ‘sight’, ‘something seen’ (cf. W. Barrett (2007) 359–61), does not fit ξύναιμον. Jebb’s preferred option, ‘face’ or ‘form’, is less likely, since the face remains covered.

ἄρα expects the answer ‘yes’ (as at 1282): ‘the appeal for confirmation is the more confident because less obviously stressed’ (Denniston 46–7). ἐμπολάω ‘do, fare’ is an extension of the commoner sense ‘engage in business’, and hence ‘buy’ or ‘sell’ (Olson on Ar. *Pax* 366–7): cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 631–2 ἡμποληκότα | τὰ πλείστ’ ἄμεινον, Hippocr. *Morb.* 4.49.2 πολλῶ κάλλιον ἐμπολήσει ὁ ἄνθρωπος. The distribution does not support Fraenkel’s claim (*ap.* Collard (2005a) 374; cf. Fraenkel (1977) 69) that the usage is colloquial, which would jar with Teucer’s grand style. For ὥσπερ ἡ φάτις κρατεῖ cf. fr. 219a.80+81+P.Oxy. 2081(b)fr.3 *TrGF* line 9 ὥσπερ ἡ [φά]τις, Aesch. *Pers.* 738 λόγος κρατεῖ σαφηνῆς τοῦτο γε, *Suppl.* 293 φάτις πολλὴ κρατεῖ.

979 δλωλεν ἀνὴρ, Τεῦκρε· τοῦτ’ ἐπίστασο. ‘The man is dead, Teucer; be sure of that.’ Initiation of contact with a newcomer by the chorus is rare (Mastronarde (1979) 20 n. 6; cf. 1316–17n.). The chorus make their attempt (emphasised, perhaps, by the repetition of Teucer’s name at 983; cf. 975) because Teucer is too overcome with grief to notice them (977–8n.; Mastronarde p. 93 compares *OC* 138–49, where the chorus are too shocked by Oedipus’ appearance to address him directly). Only at 983 does he address the chorus, and even then via an urgent question without an accompanying vocative. For ἀνὴρ (Brunck) see 9–10n.

980 ὦμοι βαρείας ἄρα τῆς ἐμῆς τύχης. ‘Alas then for my grievous fortune!’ For the expression cf. *El.* 1179 οἶμοι ταλαίνης ἄρα τῆσδε συμφορᾶς. For the orthography of ὦμοι see 227/8–232n.; for ἄρα see 738–9n.

981–2 *Antilabe* marks the heightened emotion, as does the continuing absence of contact (Mastronarde (1979) 62, Hogan (1997) 63–5).

981–2 ὡς ὦδ’ ἐχόντων — . . . | πάρα στενάζειν. ‘Know that in this situation . . . one may lament.’ The thought is repeated from 904 (n.). For ὡς see 281n.; for the genitive absolute without expressed subject see *El.* 1344n.

ὦ τάλας ἐγώ, τάλας. | . . . ὦ περισπερχές πάθος. ‘O wretched me, wretched . . . O suffering born of rashness!’ The former exclamation is found at *OC* 847 and Ar. *Thesm.* 1037/8 (paratragic; see A/O). The latter is powerfully compressed: Teucer’s suffering (πάθος) results from Ajax’s impetuous (περισπερχές; cf. Tr. Adesp. fr. 254 *TrGF* περισπερχοῦς βοῆς, Hdt. 7.207) act of suicide. Teucer’s interruptions are syntactically independent of the

intervening statements, signalling his self-absorbed grief; for tragic parallels see Diggle (1971) 49. Dawe³ writes ϕ in 982 for manuscript ω (1197n.).

983 ἄγαν γε, Τεῦκρε. ‘Too much so, Teucer.’ For ἄγαν see 354–5n., 589–90n. For the vocative see 979n.

983–4 φεῦ τάλας. τί γὰρ τέκνον | τὸ τοῦδε; ποῦ μοι γῆς κυρεῖ τῆς Τρωάδος; ‘Alas for my wretchedness! What of the man’s child? Where in the land of Troy is he?’ At last Teucer makes contact with the chorus (979n.), but rather than wasting time on preliminaries (985–7n.), he quickly turns to the most urgent problem. Successive questions beginning τί and ποῦ are also found at 101–2, where see n. for γὰρ introducing a question and for a verbless question followed by a supplementary question with a verb.

985 μόνος παρὰ σκηναῖσιν. ‘Alone by the huts.’ μόνος (29–31n.) picks up τέκνον by the sense construction (cf. Bruhn §22).

985–7 οὐχ ὅσον τάχος | δῆτ’ αὐτὸν ἄξεις δεῦρο, μή τις ὡς κενῆς | σκύμνον λεαίνης δυσμενῶν ἀναρπάσῃ; ‘Then won’t you bring him here with all speed, in case an enemy seizes him like the whelp of a lioness robbed of her mate?’ Teucer’s urgent address to Tecmessa, like his questions to the chorus (983–4n.), is unencumbered by a vocative. His simile implies a comparison of Ajax to a lion, a familiar image for a warrior (in Greek from Homer on, and in Near Eastern literature: cf. West (1997) 246–7, 341–3, 388, 572–3). Language and situation recall Hom. *Il.* 18.318–22, describing Achilles before the corpse of Patroclus: πυκνὰ μάλ᾽ αὖ σπενάχων, ὥς τε λῖς ἠϋγένης, | ϕ ῥά θ’ ὑπὸ σκύμνου ἐλαφιβόλος ἀρπάσῃ ἀνήρ | ὕλης ἐκ πυκινῆς, ὃ δέ τ’ ἄχυνται ὕστερος ἐλθὼν, | πολλὰ δέ τ’ ἄγκε’ ἐπῆλθε μετ’ ἀνέρος ἔχυν’ ἐρευνῶν, | εἰ ποθεν ἐξεύροι· μάλ᾽ αὖ δριμύς χόλος αἰρεῖ. As befits the different status of the characters, in S. Ajax, not Teucer, corresponds to the lion. Cf. also Aesch. *Ag.* 1258–9, where the absence of the lion causes trouble to the family unit.

Tragic ὅσον τάχος occurs once in comedy (Ar. *Thesm.* 727; cf. K–G I 27–8). For δῆτα (42n.) in the same sentence-position cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 1104 οὐχ ὡς τάχιστα δῆτά μ’ ἄξει’ ἐς δόμους. Its unusual line-initial position exemplifies Sophocles’ ‘tendency . . . to ignore the constraints normally associated with period-end’ (West (1982) 84); cf. *OR* 1084–5 οὐκ ἂν ἐξέλθοιμ’ ἔτι | ποτ’ ἄλλος, Dawe on *OR* 30, Martinelli (1997) 95–7, Battezzato (2001) 21 = (2008) 127–8, and Ar. *Nub.* 399, where δῆτα begins a clause. Hence we should not write δεῦρ’ αὐτὸν ἄξεις δῆτα with Elmsley (1814) 367, which puts the particle uncomfortably late in its clause. While arguing against line-initial τω at Hom. *Od.* 11.289, Wackernagel (1925b) 52 = (1953–79) II 1192 remarks that nothing similar is found before Sophocles (specifying *OR* 1084–5).

My translation of κενῆς (owed to Ll-J/W, *So.* after Σ p. 213 Chr.; Kvčičala (1862) 406 compares [Bion] 1.59, Ov. *Mel.* 14.831) is superior to ‘robbed of her

young’, which requires the adjective to be understood proleptically (cf. FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 221, Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.276(c); Johnson p. 239 obtains this sense without prolepsis by writing κενόν), because it (i) gives a more precise and pointed analogy (‘the point lies in the comparison not of Tecmessa to a lioness, but of Ajax to a lion’: Campbell), (ii) fits better with the maxim at 988–9 which Teucer uses to justify his request (thus Kamerbeek), and (iii) gives the adjective the same sense as at 971, which is thematically desirable.

988 ἴθ’, ἐγκόνει, σύγκαμνε. ‘Go, make haste, join in the labour!’ For ἐγκονέω with another verb in parallel see 811n. For συν– of assistance cf. 1316–17, 1378–9, *El.* 986–7n.

988–9 τοῖς θανοῦσι τοι | φιλοῦσι πάντες κειμένοις ἐπεγγεῶν. ‘All men love to mock the dead as they lie.’ Mistreating Eurysaces would vicariously outrage Ajax. Attacking a dead man, a proverbial (for sententious τοι see 455–6n.) act of wickedness (cf. Hom. *Od.* 22.412, Archil. fr. 134 *IEG*), is usually expressed in terms of treading on the body (cf. 1348, Ar. *Nub.* 550 κοῦκ ἐτόλμησ’ αὔθις ἐπεμπεδῆσ’ αὐτῷ κειμένῳ, Aesch. *Ag.* 884–5 ὥς τε σύγγονον | βροτοῖσι τὸν πεσόντα λακτίσαι πλέον with Fraenkel, [Sen.] *Ocl.* 455 *calcat iacentem vulgus* with Ferri). Teucer prefers a verb denoting mockery, a key theme (367n.): cf. *Eurypylus* p. 38.47–9 *TrGFs* (Astyoche) ἡ κάμβεβᾶσι τοῖν [ν]εκροῖν πρὸς τῷ κα[κ]ῷ | γέλωτ’ ἔχοντες α[.]ον Ἀργεῖοι βίαι; | (Messenger) οὐκ ἐς τοσοῦτον ἤλθον ὥστ’ ἐπεγχαν[ε]ῖν (thus Diggle; Radt at fr. 210.47–9 *TrGF* keeps the papyrus’s καὶ βεβᾶσι τὸν [ν]εκρόν). Repetition of thought in θανοῦσι... κειμένοις (cf. *El.* 245–6 θανῶν... | κείσεται, 1134 θανῶν ἔκεισο) may ‘mark the baseness of the action’ (Jebb) by stressing Ajax’s defencelessness. Exaggerated πάντες is appropriate in the mouth of a man who fears imminent annihilation from every side: cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.329–31 ὃς μὲν ἀπηνῆς αὐτὸς ἐπὶ καὶ ἀπηνέα εἰδῆ, | τῷ δὲ καταρῶνται πάντες βροτοὶ ἄλλγε’ ὅπισσω | ζωῶ, ἅτάρ τεθνεῶντι γ’ ἐφεψιόωνται ἅπαντες, Archil. fr. 133.3 *IEG* κάκιστα δ’ αἰεὶ τῷ θανόντι γίνεται. Herwerden (1862) 112 emends θανοῦσι το ἐχθροῖσι (also Meineke (1863) 285, suggesting that the corruption arose from an interlinear gloss above κειμένοις; cf. 28n.), while Seyffert’s σθένουσι (in his text) is printed by Dawe (cf. *STS* I 161–2); by removing the exaggeration they harm the rhetoric. J’s νοσοῦσι may be a (poor) conjecture.

Tecmessa leaves via eisodos B, with attendants. Teucer, coming from the camp, arrived from eisodos A; it makes sense for Tecmessa to leave in the opposite direction, which is now established as leading in the direction of Ajax’s hut.

990–1 καὶ μὴν ἔτι ζῶν, Τεῦκρε, τοῦδ’ ἐσσι μέλειν | ἐφίεθ’ ἀνὴρ κείνος, ὥσπερ οὖν μέλει. ‘Indeed, Teucer, when still alive he gave orders that the child should be your concern, as he now is.’ Cf. 560–4. καὶ μὴν implies assent (539n.).

ὥσπερ οὖν stresses ‘correspondence between idea and fact’ (Denniston 421; cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1427, K–G II 162), which is reinforced by the repetition μέλειν . . . μέλει (cf. Pl. *Phaedr.* 242e εἰ δ’ ἔστιν, ὥσπερ οὖν ἔστι, θεὸς ἦ τι θεῖον ὁ Ἔρως and, in reverse, *El.* 992–4 εἰ φρενῶν | ἐτύγχαν’ αὐτῇ μὴ κακῶν, ἐσώζετ’ ἄν | τὴν εὐλάβειαν, ὥσπερ οὐχὶ σῶζεται). For ἐφίεμαι see 112–13n. For ἀνὴρ (Brunck) see 9–10n.

992–7 ὦ τῶν ἀπάντων δὴ θεαμάτων ἔμοι | ἄλγιστον ὦν προσεῖδον ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐγώ, | δδός θ’ ὀδῶν πασσῶν ἀνιάσασα δὴ | μάλιστα τοῦμὸν σπλάγχχνον, ἦν δὴ νῦν ἔβην, | ὦ φίλτατ’ Αἴας, τὸν σὸν ὡς ἐπησθόμην | μόρον διώκων κάξιχνοσκοπούμενος. ‘O most painful of all the sights that I have seen with my eyes, and path that of all paths has most grieved my heart, which I travelled just now, o dearest Ajax, when I heard of your death as I was pursuing you and tracking your footsteps.’ Teucer opens in lofty strains: two invocations of abstract nouns (θέαμα, δδός), each amplified by accompanying genitives into a two-line phrase, eventually climax with the invocation of Ajax himself and the reference to his death. The sentence begins with the present (the sight of Ajax’s body), moves back to the journey which brought Teucer here, then back again to the rumour which prompted the journey.

Pleonastic προσεῖδον ὀφθαλμοῖς is common in epic, lyric, and tragedy (see Garvie on Aesch. *Pers.* 81–6). For the ‘most painful of all journeys’ cf. *Ant.* 1212–13 ἄρα δυστυχεστάτην | κέλευθον ἔρπω τῶν παρελθουσῶν ὀδῶν; (Creon, on hearing his son’s voice from within Antigone’s prison). The medial caesura in 994, with no elision at the break, and no break elsewhere in the metron, is rare in tragedy; see Schein (1979) 38 with n. 10 for secure examples (in this play, at 1091; 377 is lyric, [855] interpolated).

In place of πασσῶν most manuscripts have ἀπασῶν. It is easier to assume that the latter is an error encouraged by ἀπάντων in 992, than that the text originally read ὀδῶν θ’ ἀπασῶν δδός (thus Brunck, II/2 p. 171). πασσῶν may be a (correct) metrical emendation (thus Dawe, *STS* I 162). δδός τ’ ἀνιάσασα δὴ πασσῶν ὀδῶν (printed by Turnebus, Stephanus, and Johnson) removes the medial caesura, but that is not in itself objectionable (cf. 1091).

For the σπλάγχχνα as a seat of the emotions see 470–2n. For the accusative after ἔβην see 29–31n. νῦν in this position could be enclitic (δὴ νυν *coni.* Elmsley (1811a) 79).

998–9 ὀξεία γάρ σου βάξις ὡς θεοῦ τιнос | διήλθ’ Ἀχαιοὺς πάντα ὡς οἴχη θανάων. ‘For a piercing rumour about you swept through all the Achaeans, as if from a god, saying that you had died.’ Teucer cannot account for the rumour and so suggests a divine origin (cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.93–4, Hes. *Op.* 764); the audience will wonder if Zeus has answered Ajax’s prayer (823–31). ὀξύς means both ‘swift’ (a sense which it acquires from the fifth century on: see Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.213(c)) and ‘bitter’. σου denotes the object of the report

(221/2–222/3n.), διήλθε its spreading (cf. *Phil.* 255–6 μηδὲ κληδών . . . οἴκαδε | μηδ' Ἑλλάδος γῆς μηδαμοῦ διήλθε που, *Pind. P.* 11.60 διαφέρει with n.).

Elmsley (1814) 368 changed θεοῦ to θεῶν, a conjecture attacked by Hermann¹ and repudiated by Elmsley on *Eur. Med.* 241. Ll-J/W suggest ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ in their apparatus, but for the bare genitive denoting divine origin cf. *Eur. Hel.* 1162 τείχεα . . . ὥστε Διὸς ἐπέεστο φλόξ with Kannicht. For οἶχομαι with a participle like θανών cf. *Phil.* 414, Létoublon (1992) 329–30.

1000–1 κἀγὼ κλυὼν δύστηνος ἐκποδὼν μὲν ὦν | ὑπεστέναζον, νῦν δ' ὀρῶν ἀπόλλυμαι. 'And on hearing this while far off, I groaned softly in my wretchedness; but now, as I behold him, I am destroyed.' Autopsy has its own particular pain (*El.* 761–3n.). κἀγὼ is only in K^{PC}; other manuscripts read ἄγῳ. (The correction is not by the scribe; Metlikovitz (1890) 224 attributes it to the scholiast.) Elsewhere in tragedy, when ἄγῳ does not refer back to a neuter plural, it at least has some kind of plurality as its antecedent (*OR* 6, *OC* 636, *Eur. Hipp.* 653). Here α would have to pick up an unexpressed neuter understood as an equivalent to βάζις, which is harsh. For the corruption cf. *Eur. Andr.* 660, possibly *Phoen.* 878.

κλυὼν for manuscript κλύων is owed to West (cf. 151–3n.). The minority variant δείλαιος (for δύστηνος) may result from reminiscence of *Ant.* 1272 ἔχω μαθὼν δείλαιος (thus Dawe, *STS* 1 162; cf. 111n.), while μένων (for μὲν ὦν) shows incorrect word division (177–8n.): 'staying put' is the opposite of what Teucer did. For the prefix in ὑπεστέναζον see 321–2n. The lack of an explicit object presumably prompted F's σ' before ὀρῶν.

1002 οἶμοι: extrametrical interjections in tragic *rheseis* signal high emotion. As here, they can be isolated utterances (cf. *Phil.* 1018a φεῦ, *OR* 1468, 1471, 1475, *OC* 1271) or more substantial (*Tr.* 1081–6, *El.* 1160–2, *Phil.* 785–804). ὦμοι in **r** could be right, if corrected to ὦμοι (227/8–232n.).

1003 ἴθ', ἐκκάλυψον, ὡς ἴδω τὸ πᾶν κακόν. 'Come, unveil him, so I may see the whole horror.' Similar orders are given at *Eur. Med.* 1315 ἐκλύεθ' ἄρμούς, ὡς ἴδω διπλοῦν κακόν, *Hipp.* 809–10, *S. El.* 1468–9 χαλᾶτε πᾶν κάλυμ' ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν, ὅπως | τὸ συγγενές γε κἀπ' ἐμοῦ θρήνων τύχη. The latter (spoken by Aegisthus over what he thinks is the body of his step-son Orestes) suggests that the uncovering of the dead person's face could be a prelude to lamentation by a relative; Teucer's uncovering of the whole body is a more dramatic variation on this. Corpses were laid out for burial (πρόθεσις) after being washed and dressed, but not with the face covered: see Garland (1985) 23–6. The imperative ἴθι regularly means 'come' without implying movement (examples at FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 630–1, III p. 7).

An attendant who entered with Teucer unveils the corpse immediately (cf. Bain (1981) 2). Ajax's body lies there, face up (1004n.), pierced through from beneath by a sword through his middle.

1004 ὦ δυσθέατον ὄμμα καὶ τόλμης πικρᾶς ‘O face hard to look upon, full of bitter daring’. Teucer’s words at the uncovering of Ajax recall Tecmessa’s οὔτοι θεατός at his covering (915). There are two plausible ways of understanding them, of which I adopt the former:

(i) ὄμμα ‘face’ is accompanied by τόλμης πικρᾶς as a genitive of quality (cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1535–6 = III 728 ‘τόλμης is nearly the equivalent of τολμηρόν’); for the resulting expression cf. *OC* 285–6 κάρᾳ | τὸ δυσπρόσοπτον, *OR* 532–3 τοσόνδ’ ἔχεις | τόλμης πρόσωπον. The combination of adjective and genitive phrase applied to a single noun is paralleled by *Phil.* 72–3 σὺ μὲν πέπλευκας οὐτ’ ἔνορκος οὐδενὶ | οὐτ’ ἐξ ἀνάγκης οὔτε τοῦ πρώτου στόλου. This interpretation may mean that Ajax has fallen face up onto the sword (thus Golder (1990) 27, (1992) 356–7).

(ii) ὄμμα ‘sight’ (977–8n.) denotes ‘not merely the person of Ajax as an object of vision, but the whole harrowing spectacle, from which Teucer passes naturally in the next line to Ajax himself’ (Campbell; similarly W. Barrett (2007) 360–1, and cf. Mazon ‘o lugubre spectacle’). The genitive τόλμης πικρᾶς denotes ‘the outcome of a τόλμα πικρά’ (Barrett), a ‘pertinentive’ usage similar to some of those listed by Moorhouse 52 (e.g. *OC* 1505–6 καὶ σοι θεῶν | τύχην τις ἐσθλὴν τῇσδ’ ἔθηκε τῆς ὁδοῦ ‘... resulting from ...’). For the paradox thus effected in δυσθέατον ὄμμα cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 69 ὀρᾶς θέαμα δυσθέατον ὄμμασιν, perhaps Eur. fr. 953m.33 *TrGF* (cited 916–17n.), Griffith (1977) 198.

My preference is based on the following. (a) *OR* 532–3 provides a close parallel, since it too applies τόλμη as a genitive of quality to a reference to the face. (b) Despite Campbell, the connexion between 1004 and 1005 is easier if ὄμμα means ‘face’ (since the head is often used as *pars pro toto* for the person as a whole) rather than ‘spectacle’. (c) The description of Ajax’s face as ‘full of bitter daring’ attractively suggests that he retains his emotion in death. This looks forward to 1393–5, and is paralleled by other descriptions of dead warriors: cf. Sall. *Cat.* 61.4 *Catilina* . . . *reperitus est, paululum etiam spirans ferociamque animi quam habuerat vivos in vultu retinens*, Vell. Pat. 2.27.3, Sil. *Pun.* 5.673 *fronte minae durant, et stant in vultibus irae*, 13.733–4 *frons nec morte remissa | irarum servat rabiem*. The alternative interpretation makes less interesting use of the phrase. (d) Ajax’s striking countenance is three times elsewhere denoted by ὄμμα (167–8n.).

1005 ὄσας ἀνίας μοι κατασπείρας φθίνεις. ‘What pains you have sown for me by your death.’ Cf. 972–3 (n.). For metaphorical σπείρω with an unpleasant object cf. Aesch. fr. dub. 451n.1 *TrGF* μὴ σπείρειν κακ[], Hes. fr. 286.1 *M–W* εἰ κακὰ τις σπείρει, κακὰ κέρδεά <κ’> ἀμήσειεν, Pind. *N.* 8.39 μομφὰν δ’ ἐπισπείρων ἀλιτροῖς, Latin *OLD* s.v. *serō* 4. P’s gloss κατασπείρεις φθίνων more likely results from confusion of main verb and participle endings (cf. P at 57, H at 87) than from original κατέσπειρας φθίνων (*coni.* Blaydes’).

1006–7 ποῖ γὰρ μολεῖν μοι δυνατόν, εἰς ποίους βροτούς, | τοῖς σοῖς ἀρήξαντ' ἐν πόνοισι μηδαμοῦ; 'For where can I go, to what people, I who was no help in your troubles?' Teucer echoes Ajax (403–4n.), without his *hypophora* (457–72). Forceful repeated questions (cf. 1012, A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 389–94) are strengthened by asyndeton (removed by the variants ἦ and ἦ εἰς for εἰς, perhaps via intrusion of a gloss: 28n.). ἀρήξαντ' is accusative, despite μοι, as dative singulars in –ι do not elide in tragedy (*El.* 456n.); for an accusative predicate attached to a dative in an impersonal expression see *El.* 478–80n. The minority variant με may be an emendation by someone familiar with only the former point. μηδαμοῦ instead of οὐδαμοῦ shows the extension of μή to qualify causal participles (Moorhouse 331–2; see further Moorhouse (1948)).

1008–10 ἦ ποῦ <με> Τελαμών, σὸς πατήρ ἐμός θ' ἄμα, | δέξαιτ' ἄν εὐπρόσωπος ἱλεὺς τ' ἴσως | χωροῦντ' ἄνευ σοῦ. 'I suppose Telamon, your father as well as mine, might receive me with a kind and cheerful face, perhaps, when I return without you!' Sarcastic anticipation of a warm welcome from an injured party is paralleled by Eur. *Med.* 504–5 (Medea asking where she can flee) ἦ πρὸς ταλαίνας Πελιάδας; καλῶς γ' ἄν οὖν | δέξαιντό μ' οἴκοις ὧν πατέρα κατέκτανον. The concluding clause with its present participle adds to the immediacy: Telamon's anger erupts at the very moment that Teucer returns without his brother.

For ἦ πού see 176n. <με>, supplied by Küster, in his edition of the *Suda*, s.v. ποῖ (III 227; *tacite*), is superior to the <γε> of 'T.' *ap.* Bentley (pre-1742) 245.

Manuscripts confuse the endings of 1008 and 1009. In the former line, both θ' ἄμα and τ' ἴσως are well attested; in the latter, τ' ἴσως is dominant, while θ' ἄμα has slight support. Since elsewhere in tragedy θ' ἄμα 'adds something new or even paradoxical to the adjective or noun which precedes, so that there is a pairing of items which, so far from being synonymous, are either complementary or antithetical to each other' (Diggle (1997) 105, with examples), it fits better in 1008 after σὸς... ἐμός (stressing that Teucer too is Telamon's son and deserves respect, as well as the kinship between Teucer and Ajax; for other such emphatic references to shared parentage cf. Eur. *El.* 885 Αἰγισθόν, ὃς σὸν πατέρα κάμὸν ὥλεσεν and Hes. *Op.* 633 ἐμός τε πατήρ καὶ σός with West's addenda, p. 384) than εὐπρόσωπος ἱλεως (two adjectives essentially synonymous here). As for τ' ἴσως, in 1008 it would have to mean 'equally', a sense not attested before the fourth century (Tr. Adesp. fr. 649.8 *TrGF* is late: see Kannicht–Snell).

In 1009 Hermann³ emends ἴσως to ἰδών, which now acquires slight support from the gloss ἰδών in Wa on 1008 (for glosses preserving the truth see 146n.); Markland (1758–76) suggests τε σών. According to Ll-J/W (*Ss.*), 'coming after ἦ πού in the line before, ἴσως is singularly feeble', but Nuchelmans (1976) 245–6 compares 691 τάχ' ἄν μ' ἴσως (n.) and Eur. *El.* 518 ἴσως πού, where

the synonymous particles are closer together. ἴσως is also well placed after εὐπρόσωπος ἱλεώς τ', the focus of Teucer's irony.

1010–11 πῶς γὰρ οὐχ; ὅτ' ἄρα | μηδ' εὐτυχοῦντι μηδὲν ἥδιον γελᾶν. 'For how could he not? It is not his custom to laugh more sweetly even when he enjoys good fortune.' Telamon's self-description in S.'s *Teucer* is less austere (fr. 577 *TrGF*): ὡς ἄρ', ὦ τέκνον, κενὴν | ἑτερπτόμην σου τέρψιν εὐλογουμένου | ὡς ζῶντος· ἦ δ' ἄρ' ἐν σκότῳ λήθουσά με | ἔσαιν' Ἐρινύς ἡδοναῖς ἐψευσμένον. Affirmative πῶς γὰρ οὐχ; confirms a positive statement (here sarcastically); see *El.* 865n., adding Collard (2005a) 368. 'πάρεστι sometimes denotes the possession of a habit or characteristic' (Page on Eur. *Med.* 659, citing our passage); this parallel satisfies the objection of Lloyd-Jones (1978) 218 that πάρα 'is odd when we expect not "can" but "is accustomed"'.¹

For ἥδιον with γελᾶω see 79n. The contrast is between not laughter which is more and less sweet, but the absence of laughter and sweet laughter (which is sweeter than no laughter at all). A few manuscripts corrupt the adverb to ἴδιον and ἥδιστον (for the latter error see 743–4n.). The majority reading ἱλεων gives the wrong sense ('laugh graciously'); this too was an obvious corruption from ἥδιον, perhaps via ἴδιον, perhaps encouraged by ἱλεως in 1009.

1012–16 οὗτος τί κρύψει; ποῖον οὐκ ἐρεῖ κακὸν | τὸν ἐκ δορὸς γεγῶτα πολέμιον νόθον, | τὸν δειλίᾳ προδόντα καὶ κακανδρίᾳ | σέ, φίλτατ' Αἴας, ἢ δόλοισιν, ὡς τὰ σά | κράτη θανόντος καὶ δόμους νέμοιμι σοῦς. 'What will that man hold back? What insult will he not utter against the bastard, born from an enemy won by the spear, the betrayer, through cowardice and unmanliness, of you, dearest Ajax, or through trickery, so I could take control of your power and household once you were dead?' Telamon's reaction, seizing on someone to blame, is psychologically plausible (cf. Davies (1987) 65–6). The repeated questions, introduced by τί... ποῖον... for the sake of variety (parallels at Gow on Theocr. 2.91, Headlam on Herodas 6.74–8), lend force to Telamon's charges, and vividly suggest the barrage of insults which Teucer will encounter (cf. 726–7n. on the articles).

The νόθος is often the target of criticism (and defence) in tragedy: cf. fr. 87 *TrGF*, Eur. *Andr.* 632–8, fr. 168 *TrGF*, *Ion* 592, 1473. At Hom. *Il.* 8.281–5 Agamemnon urges Teucer to fight and bring glory to his father Telamon, ὃ σ' ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἔόντα | καὶ σε νόθον περ ἔόντα κομίσσατο ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ. At Eur. *Hipp.* 1082–3 Hippolytus associates his illegitimacy with his father's attack on him, but Theseus' words provide no support for this (see Barrett).

On different occasions Teucer represents his mother Hesione as a prisoner-of-war (cf. Tecmessa at 211–13n.) and as a Trojan princess, daughter of Laomedon. The former suits this passage, which describes Telamon's anger with her son for his failure to protect his other son, by a different mother; the expression is focalised from his father's perspective. The latter fits 1299–1303, where

Teucer proudly defends his lineage in response to Agamemnon's attacks. The sudden and moving intrusion of the second person and direct address to Ajax in 1015 among the putative insults expresses Teucer's outrage at the accusations. It also divides the two types of alleged motivation: cowardice versus calculation.

For the variant Αἶαν see 89–90n. *κακὰνδρία* is found elsewhere only at Aesch. fr. 132a.4 col. I.2 *TrGF* and [Eur.] *Rhes.* 814. *κράτη* . . . καὶ δόμους as a description of power is paralleled by *El.* 651, where Clytemnestra prays δόμους Ἀτρειδῶν σκῆπτρά τ' ἀμφέπειν τόδε. Hence we need not follow Blaydes' in changing δόμους to θρόνους (for the error cf. Diggle (1992) 13 = (1994) 413–14), which gives a combination found at *OR* 237, *Ant.* 166, and 173 (cf. Dawe, *STS* 1 163). νέμοιμι has a minority variant ἔχοιμι, through substitution of a commoner word of similar shape and meaning (56–8n.).

1017–18 τοιαῦτ' ἀνὴρ δύσσοργος, ἐν γήρᾳ βαρύς, | ἐρεῖ, πρὸς οὐδὲν εἰς ἔριν θυμούμενος. 'That is what he will say – a man prone to rage, oppressive in old age, angered over nothing into strife.' Anger is a characteristic of the old at Arist. *Rhet.* 1390a.11–12 οἱ θυμοὶ (sc. of old men) ὅξεῖς μὲν ἀσθενεῖς δέ εἰσιν, Cic. *Att.* 14.21.3 *amariorem . . . me senectus facit. stomachor omnia*, Cat. *Mai.* 65 at *sunt morosi et anxii et iracundi et difficiles senes* with Powell, Hor. *AP* 173, Antiphanes *A.P.* 10.100.5 = 763 *GP* χειμῶν τούντεῦθεν γήρως βαρύς; contrast 731–2n. For ἐν (effectively 'because of') see 487–8n. Distinguish βαρύς of anger (41n.) from *OR* 17 σύν γήρᾳ βαρεῖς 'oppressed by age' (cf. Headlam on Herodas 1.16, Gow on Theocr. 24.102).

1019–20 τέλος δ' ἀπωστός γῆς ἀπορριφθήσομαι, | δοῦλος λόγοισιν ἀντ' ἐλευθέρου φανείς. 'Finally, I shall be thrust out of the land and cast away, made to seem a slave, not a free man, through his words.' Teucer hints at the miseries of exile, a common tragic theme (cf. Gaertner (2007b) 9 n. 43), often associated with homicides in myth (cf. Nünlist (2009)). The moment which he anticipates was described in Pacuvius' *Teucer* (342–3 Ribbeck ≈ fr. 244 Schierl), which may reflect a Greek tragic source: *te repudio nec recipio: naturam <ab> dico: facesse, i (coni.)*. His destination was Cyprus in Pind. *N.* 4.46; so probably also Aesch. *Salaminiai*, S. *Teucer*. Welcker (1839–41) 1 191 conjectures that Teucer's exile from Salamis appeared in the *Nostoi*, from the Epic Cycle.

For ἀπωστός γῆς cf. *OR* 641 γῆς ἀπῶσαι πατρίδος, 670 γῆς ἄτιμον τῆσδ' ἀπωσθῆναι βίᾳ. As well as referring to the actual exile, ἀπορριφθήσομαι has the additional nuance 'reject with contempt' (*El.* 1018n.). Many manuscripts have –φῆσομαι; for the corruption see Diggle's apparatus on Eur. *Hec.* 335 and Kannicht's on Eur. fr. 489 *TrGF*.

λόγοισι (i.e. the words of Telamon in 1012–16), taken with the rhetorical juxtaposition δοῦλος . . . ἀντ' ἐλευθέρου (parallels cited by Davies on *Ti.* 267 ff.), implies that Teucer is ἔργῳ ἐλεύθερος (thus Jebb; cf. *El.* 287n. on ἡ λόγοισι

γενναία γυνή ‘supposedly noble’). φανείς reinforces this point, suggesting appearance rather than reality (cf. 1241). For ἀντί denoting a change of state cf. *Tr.* 148–9 ἕως τις ἀντὶ παρθένου γυνή | κληθῇ, Apollod. Caryst. vel Gelous fr. 10 *PCG* ταχὺ γε στρατιώτης γέγονας ἀντ’ ἐλευθέρου.

1021–3 τοιαῦτα μὲν κατ’ οἶκον· ἐν Τροίᾳ δέ μοι | πολλοὶ μὲν ἐχθροί, παῦρα δ’ ὠφελήσιμα, | καὶ ταῦτ’ ἄφαντα σοῦ θανόντος ἡρόμην. ‘Such will be the situation at home. But in Troy I have many enemies, and few sources of help – and those I have found gone now that you are dead.’ The verbless phrase with τοιαῦτα introduces a transition (cf. *El.* 696 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοιαῦθ’ with n.). For the generalising neuter παῦρα... ὠφελήσιμα denoting persons cf. *Phil.* 448–50, Bruhn §2. The influence of the preceding phrase encouraged corruption to (unmetrical) –οι in both words (in some manuscripts with the former word, in all with the latter; Johnson p. 239 restores the correct form). For opposition between πολλοί and παῦρα cf. *El.* 688, 1187–8, Aesch. fr. 99.4 *TrGF*, Ar. *Pax* 764, Hom. *Il.* 9.333, *Od.* 2.241, Hes. *Op.* 538, Semon. fr. 3 *IEG*, Theogn. 929–30, Sosiphanes 92 F 3.1 *TrGF*.

ταῦτ’ ἄφαντα for transmitted ταῦτα πάντα or ταῦθ’ ἅπαντα is owed to J. Jackson (1912) 157–8 (cf. (1955) 219). Changing a single letter (φ for π: 6in.) rids us of the flat and prosaic ‘and I have discovered all these things now that you are dead’, and accentuates Teucer’s plight: the illegitimate bowman looked primarily to Ajax for support (cf. the chorus’ words at 900, 1211–1215/16), and is deprived of this now that he is dead (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.88–93). Jackson punctuates with commas after ὠφελήσιμα and θανόντος, but 1022 works better as two coordinate clauses; Ll-J/W first printed the punctuation above. ἡρόμην is owed to Dindorf³ for transmitted εὔρόμην (119–20n.).

1024–7 οἶμοι, τί δράσω; πῶς σ’ ἀποσπάσω πικροῦ | τοῦδ’ αἰόλου κνώδοντος; ὦ τάλας, ὑφ’ οὗ | φονέως ἄρ’ ἐξέπνευσας. εἶδες ὥς χρόνῳ | ξιμῶν σ’ ἔκτωρ καὶ θανὼν ἀποφθίσειν; ‘*Oîmoi*, what am I to do? How will I pull you away from this bitter, glittering blade? Wretched man, by what a killer, then, you breathed your last! Did you see how Hector was destined in time to kill you even after his death?’ The question mark after κνώδοντος (thus Tweedie) gives more dramatic sense (agonised question followed by pitying exclamation) than the rambling utterance provided by the comma of the manuscripts (‘... blade, wretched man, by which killer, then, you...’), with its clumsy Greek: ‘ὦ τάλας treated as a humdrum vocative to be popped in after a convenient comma; ὑφ’ οὗ continued by a noun in awkward apposition; ἄρα neither in the second place in the clause nor after the verb, but in the least natural place of all’ (West (1978a) 116). For exclamatory ὅς West compares Eur. *Tro.* 498–9 οἱ γὰρ τάλαινα, διὰ γάμον μῖς ἕνα | γυναικὸς οἶον ἔτυχον ὧν τε τεύξομαι, Men. *Epitr.* 363.

Many manuscripts omit the pronoun after πῶς; a similar error occurs at *El.* 1127. αἰδολός of armour is especially common in epic: see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 328–9 (π 263). For causal ὑπό cf. 1253–4, Moorhouse 129. ἄρα marks the moment when Teucer realises that Hector was Ajax's φονεύς (233–4n.). ἐξέπνευσας is used absolutely to mean ἐξέπνευσας βίον; Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 1151 lists other tragic instances with the absolute usage, while for those with an object see [1029–31]n.

For the 'dead are killing the living' *topos* see *El.* 1417–21n. Hermann¹ changes the future infinitive to the aorist ἀποφθίσεια (for the corruption see Diggle (1981a) 85), but arguments supporting this are unpersuasive. (i) Hermann claims that this form is implied by the *Suda*'s entry (α 3638 = 1 328.6–9 Adler) ἀποφθίμενον· ἀποθανόντα . . . καὶ ἀποφθίσειεν [–σειν T], ἀνελεῖν, θανατωσά, followed by a citation of our passage, with the future infinitive. But the *Suda* need not have cited our passage because of its tense. (ii) The future of (ἀπο)φθίνω is otherwise unattested in Attic, whereas the aorist is found several times, always with a short iota (cf. *Tr.* 709, Wackernagel (1916a) 237 = (1916b) 77). But Homer has both aorist and future, each with a diphthong in the stem (e.g. *Il.* 16.460–1 ἔμελλεν | φθείσειν; for the orthography see West's edition, 1 xxxvi). It is probably mere chance that the Attic future is not found elsewhere (cf. West (1978a) 116); we would expect a short iota on the analogy of the aorist. (iii) Dawe, *STS* 1 163 claims that 'the aorist with μέλλω is rare enough to have prompted alteration'; rather, the aorist is sufficiently rare to make its introduction by emendation unwelcome. Dindorf (1825 edn) prefers ἀποφθιεῖν, but this future is apparently unattested.

Teucer crouches close to the body and begins to lift it from the sword.

[1028–39] Morstadt (1863) 30–1 deletes this passage (*prob.* Renehan (1992) 351, Pearce (1996) 352 n. 2). I follow him for four reasons:

(i) In 992–1027 Teucer refers to Ajax in the second person, but in 1028–39 in the third; the former passage is a passionate, personal lament specific to Teucer, whereas the latter contains nothing which he alone could say (thus Pearce). It is not even apparent whether the speaker of 1028–39 is Ajax's friend or enemy, or indeed has any connexion with him. While speeches can change direction, it is strange to move from a brother's lament to a rhetorical set-piece. The break between 1027 and 1028 is itself remarkable: 'the sudden detachment with which Ajax and Hector are held up for inspection as δύο βροτώ is . . . surprising' (West (1978a) 117). Pearce's objection puts on a sounder footing the excessively subjective condemnation of the lines by Ll-J/W (*So.* and *ST*) as 'empty bombast' (*prob.* Renehan (1992) 351).

(ii) In 1024–5 Teucer's language suggests that he is moving close to the body, to try to lift it (thus Morstadt, p. 30). This motivates Menelaus' opening words forbidding him from raising the corpse (1047–8; cf. Ley (1988) 93), and

explains why the chorus, not Teucer, spot the approaching enemy: Teucer's attention is on the body, which he may even be handling at this point. 1028–39 interrupt this focus on Ajax's corpse; detached as they are from the immediate physical reality, they need to be declaimed from a standing position, with Teucer separate from the body. Teucer could hardly have moved towards the body at 1024–5, backed off to deliver 1028–39, and then returned to handle it. (Cf. Finglass (2006c) 259 n. 16 on a similar staging posited in defence of a different interpolated passage: 'the jerkiness of this stage action, with Hecuba moving down, up and then down again, is powerful testimony to the intrusive nature of <Eur. *Hec.*> 441–3'.)

(iii) There are two examples of language strained beyond S.'s usage (West (1978a) 117 identifies the former). In 1028 πρὸς θεῶν is excessively emotive for a call to cerebral reflection (contrast the paraenetic imperatives cited by Stevens on Eur. *Andr.* 622–3). At 1035 κἀκείνον looks back five lines for its referent, a fault not eased by the syntactic compression and interposed nouns.

(iv) Teucer's defiance at 1038–9 seems misplaced.

The likely author of the passage will have been an actor expanding the part of Teucer, as LJ/W suggest. If Fries is right to claim that 1030 provides the model for [Eur.] *Rhes.* 567–8, the interpolation would date to some time before that play (not later than c. 350: see her Introduction §11.1). The language is not as objectionable as that of other interpolations (e.g. [966–70], [1105–6]), probably because of its early date: 'that hack was writing in Athens at a time when *nondum obliti erant Athenis loquere lingua Graeca*' (W. Barrett (2007) 323, on the composer of the end of Aeschylus' *Septem*).

West accepts the passage apart from 1028, where he emends τὴν τύχην δσοῖν βροτοῖν to ὡς ἐβουλεύθη τάδε, and 1035, which he thinks an interpolation 'by someone who thought that parallelism between the gifts was the point <of the passage>'. It seems to me that such parallelism is the point, and that 1035 stands or falls with the rest. As for 1028, the detachment implied by this line, which West dislikes, is not an aberration, but a characteristic of 1028–39. Raeburn deletes 1034–5, but without them the reference to the gods in 1037 is unexpected. He retains 1028, but tellingly omits πρὸς θεῶν from his translation; in Jebb's version this becomes the genteel 'I pray you'.

Explicit defences of the passage are neither numerous nor happy:

(i) According to Jebb, 'if [1028–39] were absent, Teucer's speech would end abruptly with v. 1027, and the Chorus could not well say, μή τέινε μακράν (1040)'. Rather, 1025–7 'have . . . a rhetorical force which is impaired if they are followed by the reflections on the deaths of Hector and Ajax offered by the manuscripts' (Pearce); death is the ultimate closural device, and here we have death twice over, with the dead killing the living. The chorus's contribution is irrelevant, since Teucer's speech is 36 lines long even without this passage. Had 1028–39 not been transmitted, Jebb would not, I presume, have posited

a substantial lacuna on the ground that 992–1027 insufficiently motivate the chorus's urgency.

(ii) March (1991–3) 17 defends the passage on the ground that it increases Ajax's κλέος: 'Ajax has now in a sense been given a part, along with Achilles, in the death of Hector'. This extraordinary judgment results from March's tendency to see the play as an uncomplicated celebration of Ajax's heroism; I doubt that future vindicators of the passage will adopt it.

[1028 σκέψασθε, πρὸς θεῶν, τὴν τύχην δυοῖν βροτοῖν.] 'Consider, by the gods, the fortune of the two men.' For plural imperatives 'addressed . . . to an imagined audience, the world in general as it were' see Davies on *Tr.* 1079–80; also Willink on Eur. *Or.* 128–9, Fraenkel (1967b) 192, Bain (1987) 4.

[1029–31 Ἔκτωρ μὲν, ᾧ δὴ τοῦδ' ἐδωρήθη πάρα | ζωστήρι περισθεις ἱππικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγων | ἐκνάπτειτ' αἰέν, ἔστ' ἀπέψυξεν βίον] 'Hector, his body gripped from the chariot rails by the belt which he had received from this man, was mangled right up to the moment that he gasped out his life.' In the *Iliad* Hector receives a belt from Ajax in exchange for his sword (7.303–5, cited 661–3n.). It is not mentioned again; when Achilles ties Hector's body to his chariot before dragging it back to the Greek camp (22.395–404), the fastenings consist simply of ox-hide straps (397 βόεους δ' ἐξήπτεν ἱμάντας). Our passage thus contains two differences from the Homeric account: (i) the body is tied to the chariot using the belt, and (ii) Hector is still alive at the start of the chariot journey.

(i) is not attested for a millennium (Leontius Scholasticus *A.P.* 7.151, 7.152), and is probably an innovation for this passage (thus West (1978a) 117): such a detail is only relevant within the confines of this rhetorical juxtaposition. (ii) appears to be found at Eur. *Andr.* 399–400 σφαγὰς μὲν Ἑκτορος τροχηγλάτους [v.l. –ου] | κατεῖδον, which more naturally refers to death *by* than *after* being dragged (thus Stevens); Virgil also probably uses this version (see Horsfall on *Aen.* 2.272 *perque pedes . . . tumentis*). Earlier in *Andromache* we encounter another detail of Hector's death, this time the route on which he was taken by Achilles' chariot, which again differs from the Homeric account (107–8 Ἔκτορα, τὸν περὶ τείχη | εἴλκυσε διφρεύων παῖς Ἀλκίης Θέτιδος). Death by dragging, and dragging around the walls, both intensify the horror of Hector's end, and could have been invented by any author aiming at this effect. They may even be pre-Homeric, with Homer having selected a version of the story which was not as damaging to his audience's view of Achilles. These differences from the Homeric account do not affect the question of authenticity. S.'s capacity for mythological innovation is well known, and he was free to follow the *Iliad* in some details but not in others.

Just as δωρέω and δωρέομαι (middle) can take a dative of the object given (with the recipient in the accusative), so can the passive ἐδωρήθην (attested for

tragedy at Tr. Adesp. 348h.2 *TrGF*): cf. Hdt. 8.85.3 χώρη ἐδωρήθη πολλῇ, perhaps Tr. Adesp. fr. 699a.1 *TrGF* ἔρασιμβώμοις θύμασιν δωρουμένη. Failure to understand the construction led to the corruption of τοῦδ' into τοῦτ' in most manuscripts. πισθεῖς (literally 'sawn') conveys the tight grip of the belt (as in its other Sophoclean occurrence, fr. 897 *TrGF* δάφνην φαγών ὁδόντι πριε τὸ στόμα; perhaps satyric) and 'the cutting movement of the strap to and fro across Hector's flesh' (West (1978a) 117; so rightly Campbell). For the ancient saw, and its metaphorical use in literature, see D. Müller (1974) 37–40. Wb's τρωθεῖς shows substitution of a commoner word of similar shape and meaning (56–8n.), perhaps via a gloss (28n.).

For ἀντυξ 'chariot-rail' see *El.* 746n. ἱππικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγων is similar to [Eur.] *Rhes.* 567–8 δεσμά πωλικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγων | κλάζει σίδηρον. The verb κνάπτω, referring to the carding of wool, is transferred to the mangling of bodies: cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 576 κναπτόμενοι δ' ἅλι δεινά, Pl. *Resp.* 616a, D. Müller (1974) 219–21; also Hdt. 1.92.4 (on the κνάφος used as an instrument of torture). Cf. 727–8n. on καταξάινω. Correct Attic for this period is –κν–, not the variant –γν– (see Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 760).

αἰέν is immediately limited in scope by the ἔσπε clause; we need not emend it to αὐχέν' (Morstadt (1863) 18), αἰκῶς (Enger (1860) 101), αἰνῶς (Heimsoeth (1865) 330, citing Hom. *Il.* 5.352 τείρετο δ' αἰνῶς, Aesch. *Pers.* 930; *not* Enger), or αἰών' (Hermann (1838) 415, writing εὔτ' ἀπέψυξεν βίου in addition). ἀπέψυξεν βίον is a picturesque variant on the common tragic phrase ἐκπνέω βίον (Aesch. *Ag.* 1493 = 1517, Eur. *Her.* 980, *Ion* 1600, *Hel.* 142, *Or.* 496, 1163 (ψυχή), Meleager *A.P.* 12.72.2 = 4491 *HE* (πνεῦμα)); cf. also Eur. fr. 801 *TrGF* ἀπέπνευσεν αἰῶνα, Hom. *Il.* 13.654 θυμὸν ἀποπνείων, Simon. fr. 19.2 Poltera, Pind. *I.* 7.34, *N.* 1.46–7, [Simon.] *A.P.* 7.513.2 = 1003 *FGE*. Elsewhere ἀποψύχω is attested in tragedy at Aesch. fr. 104 *TrGF*, in epic at Hom. *Il.* 21.561, *Od.* 24.348.

[1032–3 οὗτος δ' ἐκείνου τήνδε δωρεάν ἔχων | πρὸς τοῦδ' ὄλωλε θανασίμῳ πεσήμετι.] 'But this man, who received this gift from him, perished by means of it through his fatal fall.' von Bamberg (1874) 620 emends δωρεάν to δωρειάν here and at [Aesch.] *PV* 338, 616; for the error see Headlam on Herodas 5.32. –εἰά is the fifth-century form, with –εά first occurring in an inscription of 403/2 (which also contains the older spelling), and then in the second half of the fourth century (Threatte 1311). δωρεά is metrically guaranteed at Phoenixides (3rd c. bc) fr. 4.9–10 *PCG* and Tr. Adesp. fr. 302a.4 *TrGF*. Since this passage is probably from the first half of the fourth century ([1028–39n.]), when the change from one form to the other was already under way, we should probably print –εάν.

θανασίμῳ πεσήμετι is modelled on 833 and *OR* 560 θανασίμῳ χειρώματι. For πέσημα, πτώμα of a violent death see W. Barrett (2007) 354–5 n. 14.

[1034–5 ἄρ' οὐκ Ἐρινὺς τοῦτ' ἐχάλκευσε ξίφος | κἀκείνουν Ἄιδης, δημιουργὸς ἄγριος;] 'Was it not an Erinys that forged this sword, and Hades who made that belt, a fierce craftsman?' Menacing divinities moonlight as blacksmiths at Aesch. *Cho.* 646–8 Δίκας δ' ἐρείδεται πυθμῆν, | προχαλκεύει δ' Αἴσα φασγανουργός and *Ag.* 1535–6 Δικᾶ δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα θηγ<αν>εὶ βλάβας | πρὸς ἄλλαις θηγάναισ<ι> Μοῖρα. For instances of metaphorical χαλκεύω in poetry see D. Müller (1974) 144–7. For the suppression of one verb in a description of two related concepts cf. Hom. *Il.* 12.319–20 and Lobeck's n. For the orthography of Ἐρινύς see 835–7n. Instead of Ἄιδης a few manuscripts have Ἄρης (with long alpha, as at Aesch. *Sept.* 244, 469), but the chthonic Erinys makes a better pair with Hades. δημιουργός is attested in tragedy only at Eur. fr. 136.3, 1059.7 *TrGF*.

[1036–7 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν καὶ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ πάντ' ἄει | φάσκειμ' ἄν ἀνθρώποισι μηχανᾶν θεούς.] 'Now, I would say that the gods contrive for mortals these things, and all things, always.' One could have wished for a more stirring variant on the commonplace: contrast Aesch. *Suppl.* 823/4 (to Zeus) τί δ' ἄνευ σέθεν θνατοῖσ<ι> τέλειόν ἐστιν; *Ag.* 1487–8 τί γὰρ βροτοῖς ἄνευ Διὸς τελεῖται; | τί τῶνδ' οὐ θεόκραντόν ἐστιν; Theogn. 165–6, 169–72, Zuntz (1955) 43–7. For transitional μὲν οὖν see Denniston 471–2; the minority variant ἄν is not attractive (reverse error at 1339). For μηχανάω instead of the usual middle cf. fr. 269c.33 *TrGF* πάντα μηχανᾷ τὸ Δῖον ὥς[. Hom. *Od.* 18.143.

[1038–9 ὅτω δὲ μὴ τάδ' ἐστὶν ἐν γνῶμῃ φίλα, | κείνους τ' ἐκείνα στεργέτω κἀγὼ τάδε.] 'But as for the man in whose mind these things are not acceptable, let him cherish those thoughts, as I shall these.' The closing statement is familiar: cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 465–6 τῶν μὲν ἡγωνισμένων | σοὶ μὲν δοκεῖτω ταῦτ', ἐμοὶ δὲ τάντις with Collard, Euenus fr. 1.4 *IEG* σοὶ μὲν ταῦτα δοκοῦντ' ἔστω, ἐμοὶ δὲ τάδε (described as a λόγος παλαιός in the previous line), Cic. *Tusc.* 5.63 *sic se res habet; te tua, me delectant mea*. But Teucer's defiance, in defence of an uncontroversial, even trite, proposition, against no one in particular, is curiously inappropriate. Contrast the *Supplices* passage, where the antagonistic Theban Herald signals his opposition to Theseus' speech. So too at Aesch. *Ag.* 501–2 χῶστις τάδ' ἄλλως τῇδ' ἐπεύχεται πόλῃ | αὐτὸς φρενῶν καρποῖτο τὴν ἁμαρτίαν (compared to our passage by Fraenkel), the chorus suspect that Clytemnestra is bent on a course ruinous to the city. Teucer's antagonism here is targetless and misplaced. (L. Parker on Eur. *Alc.* 565 cites *Ant.* 469–70, *El.* 549–51, and *OC* 1665–6, together with our passage, as examples of the 'challenging tone' adopted by S.'s 'intransigent characters' at the end of their speeches. But of these alleged parallels, the first two are uttered by defiant figures in the presence of their enemy, and the last by a Messenger attempting to impress hearers with his veracity.)

For polyptoton of κείνος cf. Eur. *Or.* 742 οὐκ ἐκείνος ἀλλ' ἐκείνη κείνον ἐνθάδ' ἦγαγεν, Gygli-Wyss (1966) 26 n. 5. Citing the minority variant τῶκείνου, Monk on Eur. *Alc.* 545 emends τ' ἐκείνα to τὰ κείνου, but ἐκείνα gives a simpler antithesis to τάδε.

1040–1162 The scene between Menelaus and Teucer takes the form of an *agon* (*El.* 516–633n.), with two variations on the traditional form. (i) Teucer's speech is shorter than normal because he has a second speech to make, against Agamemnon (M. Lloyd (1992) 12). (ii) The single-line stichomythia which follows the two speeches is itself followed by two substantial opposing fables, before a pair of opposing couplets to close. The unprecedented variety of forms emphasises both the extent of the antagonism and its futility; after all the verbal jousting, the position has not changed, and Ajax's burial is no more or less likely than before.

1040 The chorus (but not Teucer) see Menelaus approaching from eisodos A. As a general coming to enforce his will, he is probably accompanied by armed attendants.

μή τεῖνε μακράν 'Do not stretch out your speech.' For the expression see 208–9n.

1040–1 ἀλλ' ὅπως κρύψεις τάφῳ | φράζου τὸν ἄνδρα, χῶ τι μυθήσῃ τάχα. 'but consider how you will conceal this man in a grave, and what you will say in a moment.' For the construction, and the variant κρύψῃς, see 556–7n.

1042–3 βλέπω γὰρ ἐχθρὸν φῶτα, καὶ τάχ' ἄν κακοῖς | γελῶν ἃ δὴ κακοῦργος ἐξίκοιτ' ἀνὴρ. 'For I see an enemy, and no doubt he will come laughing at our troubles, as an evil man does.' For the laughter of enemies see 79n. Contrast *OR* 1422–3, where Creon emphasises that he has not come to mock. ἄν is followed in a few manuscripts by ἐν, probably an intrusive gloss (28n.) prompted by confusion over the construction of κακοῖς. It thus provides no support for Hartung's change of ἄν to ἐν.

ἃ δὴ stands for οἷα δὴ: cf. Semon. 1.4 *IEG* ἃ δὴ βοτὰ ζόουσι (where see West's apparatus) and Pl. *Phaedr.* 244d ἀλλὰ μὴν νόσων γε καὶ πόνων τῶν μεγίστων, ἃ δὴ παλαιῶν ἐκ μηνιμάτων ποθὲν ἐν τισὶ τῶν γενῶν, ἡ μανία ἐγγενομένη...

1044 τίς δ' ἐστὶν ὄντιν' ἄνδρα προσλεύσεις στρατοῦ; 'Who from the army do you see?' Teucer stops trying to raise the body and turns to the chorus, then in the direction in which they signal, towards the eisodos. Original ἀνὴρ is incorporated into the relative clause (271–3n.). For the orthography of λεύσσω see 260–2n.

1045 Μενέλαος, ᾧ δὴ τόνδε πλοῦν ἐστείλαμεν. 'Menelaus, for whom we undertook this expedition.' Cf. Pind. *N.* 7.27–30 ὄν [sc. Αἴαντα] ... | ξανθῷ

Μενέλας δάμαρτα κομίσαι θααῖς | ἄν ναυσὶ πόρευσαν εὐθυπνόου Ζεφύροιο
πομπαί | πρὸς Ἴλου πόλιν; also *Phil.* 911 τὸν πλοῦν στελεῖν, 1037–8 στόλον
| ἐπλεύσατ'. Two manuscripts offer ἐστειλάμην (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 7), perhaps
because the singular is used of the Coryphaeus twice elsewhere in this exchange
(βλέπω, προσλεύσσεις); but the plural is superior when referring to the action
of the group.

1046 ὥρῳ· μαθεῖν γὰρ ἐγγύς ὦν οὐ δυσπετής. 'I see: he is not hard to
recognise, when close.' *δυσπετ-* is attested elsewhere in tragedy at [Aesch.] *PV*
752; elsewhere in classical Greek it occurs only at Hdt. 3.107.1 and Hippocrates,
which suggests an Ionic word.

1047–8 Menelaus and his attendants arrive on stage.

οὗτος, σὲ φωνῶ τόνδε τὸν νεκρὸν χερσὶν | μὴ συγκομίζειν, ἀλλ' ἔαν ὅπως
ἔχει. 'You there, I tell you not to join in moving this corpse with your hands,
but to leave it as it is.' οὗτος is used as an address by a new arrival (always
roughly: 71–2n.) at *OR* 532, Eur. *Alc.* 773, *Hel.* 1627. Transport of human
remains in preparation for burial can be denoted by κομίζω (*El.* 1114) and
ἐσκομίζω (Eur. *Her.* 1422). There is no exact parallel for φωνῶ governing an
indirect command, but there is for προφωνῶ (1089–90n.). Editors used to
print a point after φωνῶ, which is attractively staccato (cf. Ar. *Av.* 658 οὗτος,
σὲ καλῶ, σὲ λέγω). But if σὲ φωνῶ was a detached utterance, to choose this
of all moments to use the rare imperatival infinitive (Moorhouse 243–4), when
such an infinitive would more naturally depend on φωνῶ, would confuse,
even with a pause. Contrast 73, where Αἶαντα φωνῶ is followed by στείχε
δωμάτων πάρος with the imperative. (Schaefer first removes the point, in his
edition, 1 236.)

1049 τίνος χάριν τοσόνδ' ἀνήλωσας λόγον; 'For what purpose have you
wasted your breath in such a proud speech?' Teucer's response amounts
to 'Why?', but his formulation indicates that he is not disposed to accept
Menelaus' explanation. For the exchange cf. Men. *Sic.* 169–70 (Βλ.) ὦ γεραί,
μείνον ἐν παράστα[σιν δόμων] | (Σμ.) μένω. τίνος δὲ τοῦτο θωύσ[σεις χάριν;]
For ἀναλίσκω in this sense see A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 1130–2, adding Hyper.
Lyc. fr. 3 (perhaps high style, and thus paratragic in comedy). Inscriptional
evidence shows that ἀνήλωσας, not ἀνάλωσας, is correct Attic (cf. Elmsley
(1814) 368–9, Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 588–9). τοσόνδε refers to tone, not
quantity (770n.), since the former outrages Teucer.

1050 δοκοῦντ' ἐμοί, δοκοῦντα δ' ὅς κραίνει στρατοῦ. 'That speech is my
resolution, and the resolution of the ruler of the army.' Rather than give a
reason for his action, Menelaus emphasises the bare fact of his decision (cf. *Juv.*
6.223 *hoc volo, sic iubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas*) and the status of his brother. Syntax
reflects sense. Teucer's τίνος χάριν; is left hanging while Menelaus picks up

on λόγον, qualifying it with the participles: ‘you may regard my speech as a waste of time, but it nevertheless represents the decision of your superiors’. Jebb gives the participles a causal force (‘I speak because . . .’; cf. Campbell) and interprets them as accusative plurals; this forced interpretation becomes otiose when we recognise that Menelaus is *not* answering the question (1051n.). For δοκέω of a formal decision cf. Aesch. *Sept.* [1005–6] δοκούντα καὶ δόξαντ’ ἀπαγγέλλειν με χρῆ | δήμου προβούλοις τῆσδε Καδμείας πόλεως and ἔδοξε commonly at the start of decrees.

Elmsley (1814) 474 defends δ’ against the minority variant θ’: ‘when the same word is repeated in this manner in both members of a sentence, the particle τε ought not to be admitted into the latter member, unless it appears in the former’. See further his n. on Eur. *Held.* 874. ὅς is short for ἐκείνῳ ὅς (cf. *El.* 1123n.).

1051 οὐκουν ἄν εἴποις ἦντιν’ αἰτίαν προθεῖς; ‘Won’t you say what reason you’re putting forward?’ Teucer highlights Menelaus’ failure to answer. For οὐκουν (*Zc. coni.* Valckenaer (1743–6) 23 recto) with 2nd person optative plus ἄν (or future indicative) in ‘impatient questions, at the opening of a speech’ see Denniston 431 (also 79n.). With the participle προθεῖς we must understand λέγεις or κεύεις (etc.).

1052–90 Menelaus begins with Ajax’s crime, his attack on the Greek army (1052–60), firmly connecting this with his proposed punishment (1062–5). This argument carries weight, even if it is not cogent: Ajax has committed a dreadful act, and the exposure of his body would allow his near-victims to exact a penalty, albeit a harsh one. But Menelaus soon ends even this limited foray into ethical considerations, explaining that Ajax’s suicide allows the Atridae to control a man whom they had found uncontrollable in life (1066–70). This cowardly sentiment is followed by an excursus on the need for obedience and fear in a community (1071–86). He finishes with a final warning to Teucer not to bury the body, expressed as a buffoonish joke (1087–90).

The idea of reversal and opposition is prominent throughout. Menelaus thought Ajax a friend, but found him an enemy (1052–4). Ajax wanted himself to live and his enemies to die, but the god has reversed this (1057–60). As a result, he won’t be buried, but will have his corpse exposed (1062–5). Menelaus couldn’t control him alive, but will now that he is dead (1067–70). Before Ajax was a ὕβριστής, whereas now Menelaus can have proud thoughts (1087–8). Menelaus warns Teucer not to bury his half-brother, or he himself will be buried (1089–90). The same applies in the gnomic central section. A man, though big, should expect to fall (1077–8). People seeking pleasure may incur pain (1085–6). Phrases such as νῦν δ’ ἐνήλλαξεν θεός (1060), ἀντιτίσειν αὐθις (1086), and ἔρπει παραλλάξ ταῦτα (1087) reinforce this idea: Menelaus exults in the change of circumstances which benefits him. Such revelling in

the misfortune of others hardly elicits sympathy, any more than his delight in inflicting punishment (1064–5), his admissions of weakness (1067–70) and arrogance (1087–8), and his coarseness (1089–90). From a thematic point of view, the continual references to alternation pick up Ajax's prominent use of the same concept in his Deception Speech (646–92n.). Ajax's moving exploration of the motif highlights by contrast the juvenile delight with which Menelaus handles it.

The central section of the speech deals with lofty concepts such as αἰδώς, δέος, and σωφροσύνη, but with the emphasis on ideas of control and subjugation. Commentators compare *Ant.* 672–80, where Creon attacks disobedience, and Aesch. *Eum.* 517–25, 696–703, where the chorus and Athena exalt fear, both in a civic context; but neither of these passages contains the two ideas together, or Menelaus' 'explicit anti-democratic assertion of the subservience of commoners to their superiors' (thus Hodkinson (2005) 278 n. 31). Such emphasis may have characterised Menelaus as a typical Spartan, at least to Athenian ears (thus Hermann¹ on 852; see Knox (1983) 12 n. 12 for other scholars taking this view); Teucer certainly points to his Spartan identity (1102), although without tying this to his view of social relations. For despotic images of Sparta in fifth-century literature more generally see Poole (1994) (on Euripides), Millender (2002) (Herodotus), Hodkinson (2005) 237–9. More importantly, Menelaus seems oblivious of the applicability of some of these maxims to his own situation. His delight in his present success is untempered by the thought that he must fall or that fortune could be reversed; he is unperturbed that he is plainly 'doing what he likes' (1085) and so may end up suffering for it. This lack of self-awareness, unwillingness to deal with ethical considerations except at a very basic level, and undisguised glee at his good fortune combine to render him a worthy target of scorn.

1052–4 ὁθούνεκ' αὐτὸν ἐλπίσαντες οἴκοθεν | ἄγειν Ἀχαιοῖς ξύμμαχόν τε καὶ φίλον, | ἐξηύρομεν ξυνόντες ἐχθίῳ Φρυγῶν· 'Because, after hoping that we were bringing him from home as an ally and friend for the Achaeans, we found in our dealings with him that he was a worse enemy than the Phrygians.' The variant ἄξειν (for ἄγειν) may have arisen from the mistaken belief that ἐλπίζω, as a verb of hoping, ought to govern a future infinitive. Its distribution in the manuscripts suggests an intrusive gloss (28n.). For ἐξηύρομεν (Dindorf³: ἐξεύ–codd.) see 119–20n.

Ξυνόντες for transmitted ζητοῦντες is owed to Reiske (1753) 7. The required sense is not 'search' or 'inquire', but something like 'associate with', which ξυνόντες provides (cf. 267, 273). For the combination with εὐρίσκω cf. *OC* 944–6 ἦδη δ' ὁθούνεκ' ἄνδρα καὶ πατροκτόνον | κἀναγνον οὐ δεξιοῖατ', οὐδ' ὅτω γάμοι | ξυνόντες ἠύρεθ' ἄνοσιώτατοι. Valckenaer (1743–6) 22 verso suggests ζητοῦντ' ἔτ', but we want 'we thought him a friend, but found him

worse than an enemy’, not ‘we thought him a friend, but found him attempting worse things than our enemies do.’ And while one can ‘seek destruction’ for someone (*OR* 658–9 ἐμοὶ | ζητῶν ὄλεθρον), ‘seeking hostile things’ is not quite the right description for Ajax’s behaviour.

Scholars from Lobeck on defend the paradosis by citing passages like *OT* 68 εὖ σκοπῶν ἠύρισκον, *Ph.* 282–3 πάντα δὲ σκοπῶν | ἠύρισκον οὐδέν, *Ar. Plut.* 104–5 οὐ γὰρ εὐρήσεις ἐμοῦ | ζητῶν ἔτ’ ἄνδρα... βελτίονα, *Ran.* 96–7, *Pind. O.* 13.113, *Hdt.* 1.139, 3.41.1. But these show only that (as we might have expected) finding is often preceded by searching, not that a verb for finding can be accompanied by a verb for searching even when a search is out of the question. Rather than defending the paradosis, they suggest how a participle accompanying εὐρίσκω could have been corrupted to give a common combination. Others who retain the transmitted text adopt the sense suggested by the Byzantine scholium ἐξετάζοντες (p. 228.17–18 Dindorf), i.e. ‘as we scrutinised him’. This sense for ζητῶ is unprecedented (Dawe, *STS* 1 163–4 demolishes the parallels alleged by Pearson (1923) 27) and unexpected: it will be a guess, of no ancient authority (cf. Fraenkel (2007a) 57).

For ‘Phrygian’ as an equivalent to ‘Trojan’ cf. *Aesch. fr.* 446 *TrGF*, Degen (1900) 16–17, Keen (2005) 73–4.

1055–6 ὅστις στρατῶ ὕμπαυτι βουλεύσας φόνον | νύκτωρ ἑπεστράτευσεν, ὡς ἔλοι δορί: ‘This was the man who plotted death for the whole army and made war against them by night, to kill them with the spear.’ For ὅστις as a causal relative see 434–6n. For Ajax’s attack on the entire army see 44n. ἑπεστράτευσεν casts Ajax as a fully-fledged military foe (De Jong (2006) 92), making his attempt seem more threatening. Instead of, or as well as, ἔλοι δορί, a few manuscripts offer ἔλοιδόρει, a nonsensical variant arising from incorrect word division (177–8n.). For the other minority variant ἔλοι δόρει (*coni.* Reisig (1818) 251) see 515–17n.

1057–60 κεί μὴ θεῶν τις τήνδε πείραν ἔσβεσεν, | ἡμῆς μὲν ἂν τήνδ’ ἦν δδ’ εἴληχεν τύχην | θανόντες ἂν προῦκείμεθ’ αἰσχίστῳ μόρῳ, | οὗτος δ’ ἂν ἔζη. ‘And if one of the gods had not quenched his attempt, we would have perished by the fortune which is his lot, and be lying in a most miserable death, while this man would be alive.’ For metaphorical (κατα)σβέννυμι cf. 1149 (βοήν), *OC* 422 (ἔριν), *Aesch. Sept.* 584 (μητρὸς πηγῇ), *Ag.* 958 (θάλασσαν), *Eur. Her.* 40 (φόνος), *Critias* 43 F 19.40 *TrGF* (ἀνομία), *Hom. Il.* 9.678 (χόλος), 16.621 (μένος), *Ar. Av.* 778 (κύματι), *Xen. Hell.* 5.3.8 (φρόνημα τῶν νενικηκότων), *Anon. AP.* 7.298.3–4 = 3866–7 *HE* (ὑμέναινον).

τήνδ’...τύχην is accusative (despite going with θανόντες, which would normally demand a dative) thanks to ‘reverse attraction’ into the case of the subordinate clause ἦν δδ’ εἴληχεν (271–3n.). Alternatives are unsatisfactory. The accusative cannot be internal with θανόντες, since the alleged parallels

(cf. Eur. *Andr.* 293–4 εἰ γὰρ ὑπὲρ κεφαλὰν ἔβαλεν κακὸν | ἅ τεκοῦσά νιν μόρον [Hermann, *prob.* Stinton (1965) 73–4 = (1990) 72: Πάριν codd.], Hom. *Il.* 3.417 κακὸν οἶτον ὄλῃαι, 21.133 ὀλέσθε κακὸν μόρον, *Od.* 1.166 ἀπόλωλε κακὸν μόρον, 9.303 ἀπαλώμεθ' αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον) all mean 'die a death', not 'die a fortune/fate'. Nor can it be an accusative of respect (954/5–956n.), since one cannot 'die with respect to fortune/fate'.

Unfamiliarity with the construction encouraged three types of emendation, listed in decreasing order of plausibility. (i) Kousis (1891) 209–10 changes τήνδ' to τῇδ' (*El.* 180–1n.), which Ll-J/W follow through with τύχη. (ii) θανόντες has been emended to λαχόντες (Helvetius *teste* Seyffert, Morstadt (1863) 19–20) or φθάνοντες (Seyffert), rendering τήνδ'. . . τύχην a direct object; but 'θανόντες has the advantage of being antithetical to ἐζη' (Ll-J/W, *So.*). (iii) Nauck^{3a} deletes τήνδ'. . . θανόντες ἄν, but the motive for the alleged interpolation is obscure.

For πρόκειμαι of the dead see 426–426/7n. Instead of αἰσχίστῳ there are two unattractive variants, ἀθλίῳ (weak in sense and manuscript support) and ἐχθίστῳ (a common corruption; see L. Parker on Eur. *Alc.* 1037, adding *OR* 1519, Eur. *Hec.* 200).

1060[–1] νῦν δ' ἐνῆλλαξεν θεός | [τὴν τοῦδ' ὕβριν πρὸς μῆλα καὶ ποίμνας πεσεῖν]. 'But as it is, a god has changed it round.' For νῦν δέ see 445–6n. The sense is, 'we are alive and he is dead' (Reeve (1973) 161, supporting the deletion of 1061 by Nauck⁴). Keeping 1061 leads to two problems: (i) ἐνῆλλαξεν implies 'exchange' or 'alternate', whereas here it would have to mean 'diverted'. (ii) 'Fall on' in the sense of 'attack' should be rendered πεσεῖν ἐν (cf. 185, 300, 374–5), not πεσεῖν πρὸς; the preposition may come from πρὸς. . . ποίμνας ἐκτρέπω in 53 (referring to the same action), an obvious quarry for an interpolator. The brevity of νῦν δ' ἐνῆλλαξεν θεός (cf. 1087, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 332 πόλλ' ἀναστρέφει θεός) encouraged supplementation: 'the interpolator has ruined the sense by completing an elliptical expression that he either disliked or did not understand' (Reeve).

Stanford attempts to avoid problem (i) by translating 'God has made a change with regard to his violence of spirit, to make it fall on cattle and flocks', but τὴν. . . ὕβριν can hardly be an accusative of respect, coming as it does so soon after a regularly transitive verb. According to Ll-J/W (*So.*), the sense is not 'fall upon' but 'fall in the direction of', yet Lloyd-Jones in his Loeb translates 'so that it fell upon'.

1062–3 ὦν οὐνεκ' αὐτὸν οὐτις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ σθένων | τοσοῦτον ὥστε σῶμα τυμβεύσαι τάφῳ 'For that reason there is no man strong enough to bury the body in a tomb'. Menelaus quickly slips into mere assertion of force: superior might makes the difference. This will be undercut by his admission that he was not powerful enough to control Ajax when he was alive, as well as his implied criticism of that man for relying on his massive bulk (1077–8). αὐτόν

is taken up by σώμα in the subordinate clause: cf. 1147–9, *Ti.* 287–9 αὐτὸν δ' ἐκείνον . . . | φρόνει νιν ὡς ἦξοντα. The minority reading τοσοῦτον should be preferred over τοιοῦτον: Menelaus is concerned not with kinds, but degrees of strength.

1064–5 ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ χλωρὰν ψάμαθον ἐκβεβλημένος | ὄρνισι φορβὴ παραλίῳ γενήσεται. 'But cast out somewhere on the yellow sand, he will become food for the birds of the shore.' 'The vagueness implied by ἀμφὶ add[s] to the scorn of the threatened disposal of Ajax's corpse' (Moorhouse 97). χλωρός is often 'green', but qualifies μέλι at Hom. *Il.* 11.631, *Od.* 10.234, Stes. fr. 179a.2 *PMGF*; see further Clarke (2004) 133–6. ψάματος is poetic, as opposed to ψάμος, which occurs in poetry and prose (see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 870). For ἐκβάλλω in this context cf. 1177 (ἐκπίπτω, used as the passive of this verb), [1388], 1392, Knox (1983) 17 n. 16 ('a key word in the Sophoclean tragic vocabulary').

For the location of the corpse cf. the description of the perjured man at Hipponax fr. 115 *IEG*, especially line 13 ἄκρον παρὰ ῥηγμῖνα. For the corpse as a feast for birds cf. Timoth. fr. 791.137–8 *PMG* = Hordern ἐνθα κείσομαι οἰκτρὸς ὀρνίθων ἔθνεσιν ὠμοβρώσι θοινά, Glaucus *A.P.* 7.285.3–4 = 1817–18 *HE*, Ov. *A.A.* 3.35–6 with Gibson; often in such expressions birds are accompanied by dogs (829–30n.). Naber (1881) 215 pedantically proposes παράλιος (now found in R), on the ground that the adjective applies more to the corpse than the birds. For φορβή cf. Eur. fr. 1152a *TrGF* ἐκθεῖναι κήτει φορβάν; the noun is found only in epic, tragedy, and Herodotus (paratragic at Ar. *Av.* 348).

1066 πρὸς ταῦτα μηδὲν δεινὸν ἐξάρης μένος. 'In view of this, do not rouse your grim wrath.' For minatory πρὸς ταῦτα see 971n. For ἐξάρης μένος cf. Eur. *Alc.* 346 φρέν' ἐξαίραιμι, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐξαίρω 1 3. Instead of ἐξάρης L has ἐξαίρης, but after μηδὲν we need the aorist subjunctive; for corruption of ἄρ- to αἰρ- see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 342.

1067–9 εἰ γὰρ βλέποντος μὴ δυνήθημεν κρατεῖν, | πάντως θανόντος γ' ἄρξομεν, κἂν μὴ θέλῃς, | χερσὶν παρευθύνοντες. 'For if we couldn't control him alive, at least we'll master him dead, even if you're against it, controlling him in our hands.' The concentration and variety of verbs denoting control (κρατεῖν, ἄρξομεν, παρευθύνοντες) reinforces this cowardly sentiment.

For βλέπω 'I am alive' see 962–3n. For non-articular participles referring to a specific individual see 269n. γ' is omitted in some manuscripts, but the emphasis on θανόντος is pointed, and the particle often drops out. παρευθύνοντες is not attested elsewhere. Campbell proposes that the prefix 'suggests the image of a slave-driver walking beside a gang of slaves and keeping them in line'; this squeezes quite a lot from a small (part of a) word, but

could be right. *χερσίν* suggests the physical intervention of the master; it also contrasts with *λόγων* in the next sentence (n.). Contrast the uses of *εὐθύνω* described in 71–2n., 541–2n. (the latter also with *χερσίν*).

1069–70 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπου | λόγων γ' ἀκοῦσαι ζῶν ποτ' ἠθέλησ' ἐμῶν. 'As for my words, he never wanted to listen to them when he was alive.' A trace of Campbell's *λόγων γ'* (*prob.* Dawe, *STS* 1 164, Fraenkel (2007a) 58) survives in the majority reading *λόγων τ'*; after corruption from *γ'* to *τ'*, some manuscripts lost the nonsensical *τ'*. It is less plausible that bare *λόγων* acquired *τ'* for reasons unknown. *γ'* gives desirable sense, contrasting *λόγων* (already highlighted by being fronted in its clause) with *χερσίν* in 1069; for their association cf. 1381–4, *OR* 883–4 εἰ δέ τις ὑπέροπτα χερσίν | ἢ λόγῳ πορεύεται, *OC* 1296–7 οὔτε νικήσας λόγῳ | οὔτ' εἰς ἔλεγχον χειρὸς οὐδ' ἔργου μολῶν, *Eur. El.* 593, *Phoen.* 313, *Andoc.* 1.97 καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ καὶ ψήφῳ καὶ τῇ ἑμαυτοῦ χειρί, *Hom. Il.* 1.77 ἔπessιν καὶ χερσίν ἀρήξεν.

1071–2 καίτοι κακοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἀνδρα δημότην | μηδὲν δικαιοῦν τῶν ἐφεστῶτων κλύειν. 'And yet it is the mark of a bad man when a commoner does not deign to listen to the authorities.' Menelaus absurdly maps the relationship between Ajax and the Atreidae onto the opposition between δημότης and ruler, for which cf. *Tyrt.* fr. 4 *IEG* (the δημόται ἀνδρες come third in the Spartan constitution, after the βασιλεῖς and γέροντες), *Hdt.* 2.172.2 τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα κατῴωνοντο τὸν Ἀμασιν Αἰγύπτιοι... ἅτε δὴ δημότην τὸ πρὶν ἑόντα καὶ οἰκίης οὐκ ἐπιφανέος, 2.172.5 εἰ γὰρ πρότερον εἶναι δημότης, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ παρεόντι εἶναι αὐτῶν βασιλεύς, 5.11.2 οὐ τύραννος δημότης δὲ ἔων.

καίτοι introduces an adversative statement in a compressed syllogistic structure (Denniston 563). Rather than saying 'Ajax did not listen to his leaders. Only bad men do not listen to their leaders. Therefore Ajax was a bad man', Menelaus implies the conclusion through the particle. πρὸς + genitive = 'in the nature of' is illustrated at 319–20n.

δημότης in tragedy always means 'ordinary citizen, commoner', never 'member of the citizen body' (cf. Brock (2010) 97, 104 n. 44). For ἀνδρα δημότην cf. *Ant.* 690, *Ar. Ach.* 328, *Nub.* 1219, *Eccl.* 1023, *Plut.* 254, *Tyrt.* fr. 4.5 *IEG*, *Xen. Cyr.* 2.3.15. Juxtaposition of this and κακοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς is paralleled by 1093, *Aesch. Ag.* 1626–7 εὐνὴν ἀνδρὸς αἰσχύνων... | ἀνδρὶ [φωτὶ Karsten] στρατηγῷ τόνδ' ἐβούλευσας μόρον; No emphasis falls on the different forms of ἀνήρ; contrast the rhetorical effect sought in the juxtapositions examined by West on *Hes. Op.* 23 ζηλοῖ δέ τε γείτονα γείτων. There is no good reason to emend ἀνδρα to ὄντα (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 7), ἀνδρὸς to φωτὸς (*coni.* Postgate *ap.* Pearson), or (at 1093) ἀνδρα to φῶτα (*coni.* Heimsoeth (1865) 129).

1073–6 οὐ γὰρ ποτ' οὔτ' ἂν ἐν πόλῃ νόμοι καλῶς | φέροντ' ἂν, ἔθνα μὴ καθεστήκοι δέος, | οὔτ' ἂν στρατὸς γε σωφρόνως ἀρχοιτ' ἔτι, | μηδὲν φόβου

πρόβλημα μηδ' αἰδοῦς ἔχων. 'For the laws could never function properly in a city where fear is not firmly established, nor, for that matter, could an army be ruled with due consideration without the protection afforded by fear and restraint.' Menelaus associates good order with δέος (φόβος) and αἰδώς. For the former, cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 517–25 (text uncertain) ἔσθ' ὅπου τὸ δεινὸν εὔ, | καὶ φρενῶν ἐπίσκοπον | δεῖ μένειν καθήμενον· | ξυμφέρεϊ | σωφρονεῖν ὑπὸ στένει. | τίς δὲ μηδὲν ἴεν φάει† | καρδίαν ἴανατρέφων† [δέος τρέφων Campbell] | ἡ πόλις, βροτός θ' ὁμοίως ἔτ' ἂν σέβοι Δίκαν;, 697–9 βουλεύω... | ... μὴ τὸ δεινὸν πᾶν πόλεως ἔξω βαλεῖν· | τίς γὰρ δεδοικώς μηδὲν ἔνδικος βροτῶν;, Critias 43 F 19 *TrGF*, especially lines 9–15, Thuc. 2.37.3 τὰ δημόσια διὰ δέος μάλιστα οὐ παρανομοῦμεν, Plut. *Agis et Cleom.* 30.2 (the Spartans) τιμῶσι... τὸν Φόβον... τὴν πολιτείαν μάλιστα συνέχεσθαι φόβῳ νομίζοντες; for the latter, cf. Pl. *Prot.* 322c (Zeus in fear for the survival of humanity) Ἐρμῆν πέμπει ἄγοντα εἰς ἀνθρώπους αἰδῶ τε καὶ δίκην, ἵν' εἴεν πόλεων κόσμοι τε καὶ δεσμοὶ φιλίας συναγωγοί. In Plato, αἰδώς accompanies δίκη, whereas in the harsher world of Menelaus' polity it is accompanied by fear: cf. 1079, Hom. *Il.* 15.657–8 ἴσχε γὰρ αἰδώς | καὶ δέος, *Cypria* fr. 29.2 *GEF* ἵνα γὰρ δέος, ἔνθα καὶ αἰδώς, Hom. *Hym.* 2.190 τὴν δ' αἰδώς τε σέβας τε ἰδὲ χλωρόν δέος εἶλεν with Richardson, Pl. *Resp.* 465ab ἱκανῶ... τῷ φύλακε κωλύοντε, δέος τε καὶ αἰδώς, Plut. *Agis et Cleom.* 30.7 τὸ γὰρ αἰσχύνεσθαι μάλιστα συμβαίνει πρὸς οὓς καὶ τὸ δεδοικέναι τοῖς πολλοῖς. His concern for the proper functioning of νόμοι (taken up by his brother at 1246–7) is inconsistent with his focus elsewhere on mere physical coercion. For the power of νόμος at Sparta cf. Demaratus' words to Xerxes (Hdt. 7.104.4); for σωφροσύνη associated with Spartans Humble (1999) 351 n. 49 cites Thuc. 1.68.1, 1.79.2, 1.84.2–3, Critias D–K 88 B 6 (π 378.15–380.4), and cf. *ead.* (2002). None of these virtues is specifically Spartan, but their combination may have characterised Menelaus as a typical Lacedaemonian to Athenian ears, at least.

For the orthography of πόλη see 850–1n. For φέρομαι with an adverb referring to a state cf. Thuc. 2.60.3 καλῶς... φερόμενος ἀνὴρ, LSJ⁹s.v. φέρω B II 1. καθίστημι denotes firm, permanent establishment (1246–7n.). Either καθεστήκοι or καθεστήκη gives the required indefinite sense. Moorhouse 233 lists three places in S. where an indefinite relative clause follows a potential optative main verb. In one, *OC* 560–1, the verb in the relative clause is a metrically guaranteed optative; in the other two, manuscripts are split (*Ti.* 1235, *Phil.* 409), although L has the optative both times, as it may have done in our case before 'correction' to the subjunctive. The meagre evidence suggests a preference for the optative, and I have printed accordingly. But the reverse case can be made: absence of ἄν with an original subjunctive (758–61n.) may have caused corruption to an optative, especially with the surrounding optative verbs. The manuscripts also offer –ει (*coni.* B. Heath (1762) 11) and –ε (from which Brunck conjectured –εν), and a similar context at 1094 transmits the

indicative; that passage too could be emended to subjunctive or optative. The variants παρεστήκει and παρεστήκη in Stobaeus (4.1.14 = IV 4.18 W–H) give the wrong sense (‘stand by’). ἄρχειν ἔτι is corrupted to ἄρχειτό τις in H: for errors involving word division and elision see 177–8n. Instead of ἄρχειν L^{ac} has ἔχειν, a commoner word of similar shape (56–8n.).

1077–8 ἄλλ’ ἄνδρα χρῆ, κἂν σῶμα γεννήσῃ μέγα, | δοκεῖν πεσεῖν ἂν κἂν ἀπὸ μικροῦ κακοῦ. ‘But a man, even if he grows an enormous frame, must expect to fall through even a small affliction.’ Menelaus disparages Ajax’s size; Calchas’ warning (758–61n.) used similar vocabulary (σῶμα, πίπτω). The ‘small affliction’ does not correspond to any particular incident, but stresses, through juxtaposition of opposites, the vulnerability of his bulk.

γεννάω (usually ‘beget’, ‘bring forth’, ‘produce’) is oddly predicated of a man when the object is his own body; LSJ⁹ s.v. 2 and DGE s.v. 14 both put it in a category of its own. The common use of φύω in expressions such as *El.* 1463 φύσῃ φρένας (n.) is an imperfect parallel (φύω takes a part of the body as its object, not the whole), but no good emendation is to hand; we must assume a bold linguistic turn on S.’s part. Perhaps the extraordinary size of Ajax’s body makes it an entity in its own right, conceptually separate somehow from Ajax the person. Scaliger (1568–1609) writes μέγας, which turns σῶμα into an accusative of respect (cf. 1253), and supposes corruption of the adjective into the gender of the nearest noun. But the resulting sense would have to be ‘if he grows big of body’, and γεννάω meaning γίγνομαι is unparalleled.

κἂν ἀπὸ μικροῦ κακοῦ is an abbreviated expression for κἂν ἀπὸ μικροῦ κακοῦ πέσῃ; as at *El.* 1482–3 (n.) ἀλλά μοι πάρες | κἂν μικρὸν εἰπεῖν, the καί goes closely with the following adjective.

1079–80 δέος γὰρ ᾧ πρόσεστιν αἰσχύνῃ θ’ ὁμοῦ, | σωτηρίαν ἔχοντα τόνδ’ ἐπίστασο. ‘For when fear and respect together attend a man, know that he possesses security.’ The connexion of δέος and αἰσχύνῃ picks up the earlier link between δέος and αἰδώς (1073–6n.). The idea that δέος leads to σωτηρία is paralleled by Aesch. *Eum.* 700–2 τοιόνδε τοι ταρβοῦντες ἐνδίκως σέβας | ἔρυμά τε χώρας καὶ πόλεως σωτήριον | ἔχειν ἄν, οἷον οὕτως ἀνθρώπων ἔχει. For ὅς picked up by ὅδε cf. *Phil.* 86–7, Bruhn §82.

1081–3 ὅπου δ’ ὑβρίζειν δρᾷν θ’ ἂ βούλεται παρῇ, | ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν χρόνῳ ποτὲ | ἐξ οὐρίων δραμοῦσαν εἰς βυθὸν πεσεῖν. ‘But when a man can indulge in wanton violence and do as he likes, be assured that this city, though previously sped by favouring breezes, in time will fall to the depths.’ Ironically, Menelaus deprecates action based on the speaker’s will, when that has been his preferred way of explaining his own behaviour (1050n.). His comparison of the lawless city to a sinking ship exploits a familiar image: cf. Alcaeus fr. 6, 208 Voigt, Theogn. 855–6 πολλάκις ἡ πόλις ἦδε δι’ ἡγεμόνων

κακότητα | ὥσπερ κεκλιμένη ναῦς παρὰ γῆν ἔδραμεν, Pl. *Polit.* 302a πολλὰι <πόλεις> . . . καθάπερ πλοῖα καταδυσόμεναι διόλλυνται, Van Nes (1963) 71–92, Nisbet and Hubbard’s commentary on Horace *Odes* 1, p. 180, West (1997) 531–2, M. Wright (2005) 207 n. 175.

For the idea that ὕβρις destroys the *polis* see Theogn. 43–4; for the similarly destructive consequences of ‘doing what one likes’ (a ‘conservative perversion’ of the democratic ideal: Wallace (2007) 194) cf. Pl. *Laches* 179a ἡμῖν . . . δέδοκται . . . μὴ . . . ἀνεῖναι αὐτοὺς ὅτι βούλονται ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ νῦν δὴ καὶ ἄρχεσθαι αὐτῶν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.12 (of the illegal trial after the battle of Arginusae) τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἐβόα δεινὸν εἶναι εἰ μὴ τις ἑάσει τὸν δῆμον πρᾶττειν ὃ ἂν βούληται.

The aorist infinitive πεσεῖν refers to future time (*El.* 442–3n.). Schneidewin takes it as an original gnomic aorist; but are such aorists used in subordinate clauses? For the absence of ἄν in 1081 see 758–61n.; as there, the lack of the particle may have encouraged the variant πᾶρα for παρῇ. Elmsley (1814) 475 supplies the ‘missing’ particle by writing ποτ’ ἄν, but the position of ἄν in the sentence is improbable (thus Hutchinson on Aesch. *Sept.* 427–8); he recants on *Eur. Med.* 362.

ἐξ οὐρίων δραμοῦσαν refers to the city’s previous state of prosperity; this makes its fall the more striking, and anticipates the antitheses in 1085–6 and 1087–8. Campbell (in his edition and *PS*) prefers the sense ‘will drift from her right course and founder’, but this requires ἐξ to mean ἐξω (as at Pind. *P.* 11.39–40 ἡ μὲ τις ἄνεμος ἐξω πλόου | ἔβαλεν, ὥς δὲ τ’ ἄκατον εἰναλίαν; Aesch. *Cho.* 1022–3, [Aesch.] *PV* 883–4). Changing ἐξ to κάξ (thus Morstadt (1863) 21–2, supposing a crasis error: 39n.) yields ‘even though it was sped . . .’; but the concessive sense is clear without the particle.

1084–6 ἀλλ’ ἐστάτω μοι καὶ δέος τι καίριον, | καὶ μὴ δοκῶμεν δρῶντες ἂν ἡδόμεθα | οὐκ ἀντιτείσσειν αὐθις ἂν λυποῖμεθα. ‘No, let me have established a proper sense of fear, and let us not think that we can act according to our pleasure and not then in turn pay a penalty which causes us pain.’ For Menelaus’ emphasis on fear see 1073–6n. The antithesis ἡδόμεθα . . . λυποῖμεθα suggests the proverbial wisdom ‘if you do what you want, you will suffer what you don’t want’: cf. Alcaeus fr. 341 Voigt [see V.’s edition for the text] αἶ κ’ εἴπῃς τὰ θέλης, <καὶ κεν> ἀκούσαις τὰ κ’ <εν> οὐ θέλοις, Ter. *Andr.* 920 *si mihi perget quae volt dicere, ea quae non volt audiet*, Liban. *Or.* 25.58 (II 564.14–15 Foerster) δρῶντες ἄττα ἐθέλουσι, πᾶσχειν δύναντ’ ἂν ἄττα ἂν οὐκ ἐθέλοιεν. Rhyme at line-end (807–8n.) reinforces the connexion.

λυποῖμεθα is owed to Linwood⁴ for transmitted λυπώμεθα. The required sense is not ‘pay whatever penalty causes us pain’ (indefinite subjunctive) but ‘pay a penalty which causes us pain’ (potential optative). The corruption probably results from attraction into the mood of its antithesis, perhaps encouraged

by the resulting rhyme. ἐστάτω (cf. 200) may be used instead of καθεστάτω because of the near-repetition from 1074 (392–3n.). καίριον means ‘appropriate in kind and degree’ (Race (1981) 209, comparing *Phil.* 637–8, Eur. *Hipp.* 386–7). For the orthography of ἀντιπείσειν (*coni.* Nauck⁸ p. 183) see 112–13n. Instead of αὔθις Stobaeus (4.1.17 = IV 5.12–17 W–H) reads epic/Ionic αὔτις; this corruption is found in some Sophoclean manuscripts (including L in each case) at *Phil.* 127, 541, *OC* 234/5, 1438, but elsewhere αὔθις is overwhelmingly preferred.

1087–8 ἔρπει παραλλάξ ταῦτα. πρόσθεν οὗτος ἦν | αἶθων ὕβριστής, νῦν δ’ ἐγὼ μέγ’ αὖ φρονῶ. ‘These things go by turns. Before this man was blazing in his insolence, but now it is I who think big.’ Pointing to ἔρπει παραλλάξ ταῦτα and αὖ, Cairns (1996) 11–12 shows that for Menelaus, being a ‘blazing *hybristes*’ and ‘thinking big’ are parallel predicates with similar sense (cf. Dickie (1984) 106; *contra* Fisher (1992) 315–16). ‘Menelaus intends a parallel between unjustified and justified “thinking big” [cf. 1125n.]; but the logic of ἔρπει παραλλάξ ταῦτα is best preserved if the audience take him at his word, and see both forms of “thinking big” as illegitimate’ (Cairns p. 12). Normally ὕβρις is something one disclaims or warns others against (1091–2n.).

For the taut statement ἔρπει παραλλάξ ταῦτα cf. 1060. For the idea of alternation in human fortunes cf. Eur. fr. 262 *TrGF*; also 131–2. ῥέπει (*coni.* Valckenaer (1743–6) 23 recto) would give an image of scales now heavier on this side, now on that; but for ἔρπει in this context (predicated of man) cf. *Ant.* 367/8 τοτὲ μέν κακόν, ἄλλοτ’ ἐπ’ ἐσθλὸν ἔρπει. Garvie calls παραλλάξ ‘prosaic’, but ἐναλλάξ occurs in poetry at Pind. *N.* 10.55 (of the alternating immortality of Castor and Pollux), as well as at Ar. *Nub.* 983 (of crossing the legs). For αἶθων of persons see 221/2–222/3n. For ὕβρις and fire see 197–8n.

1089–90 καὶ σοι προφωνῶ τόνδε μὴ θάπτειν, ὅπως | μὴ τόνδε θάπτων αὐτὸς εἰς ταφὰς πέσῃς. ‘And I warn you not to bury this man, in case while burying him you yourself fall into the grave.’ The idea (here a buffoonish jibe) is also implied at Eur. *Phoen.* [1658] (Creon to Antigone) σαυτὴν ἄρ’ ἐγγὺς τῷδε συνθάψεις νεκρῷ. For προφωνῶ ‘warn’ cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 616–17 (*coni.*), Eur. fr. 245.8 *TrGF* ἐν δέ σοι μόνον προφωνῶ, *Hipp.* 955–6; also φωνῶ at 1047–8 (n.). Fraenkel (1977) 32 compares λέγω σοι, which often has a threatening nuance: cf. *OC* 840 χαλὰν λέγω σοι, Hdt. 8.68α καὶ τοι τάδε λέγω, φείδεο τῶν νεῶν μηδὲ ναυμαχίην ποιέο, Collard (2005a) 370.

Here and at 1109 ταφὰς denotes ‘place of burial’ (thus Lobeck^{2–3}; LSJ⁹ s.v. ταφή 2 compares Hdt. 4.71.3, 5.63.4). Jebb supports the usual meaning ‘funeral rites’ in both passages. But the language of each suggests motion into (despite Jebb’s reference to Thuc. 3.82.2 ἐς ἀκουσίους ἀνάγκας πίπτειν); and the coarse physical threat that Teucer may fall into the very grave that he is trying to dig brings out Menelaus’ oafish humour.

1091–2 Μενέλαε, μὴ γνῶμας ὑποστήσας σοφᾶς | εἴτ' αὐτὸς ἐν θανοῦσιν ὕβριστὴς γένη. 'Menelaus, don't lay down wise precepts and then yourself commit outrage against the dead.' The chorus are conciliatory in their disagreement, acknowledging that Menelaus' γνῶμαι are σοφαί even if he fails to live up to them. The warning against being a ὕβριστὴς emphasises how remarkable it was for Menelaus to come so close to predicating that noun of himself (1087–8n.). εἴτα 'with the leading verb after a part<iciple> is often used when the speaker protests at the inconsistency of the two actions' (Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 702–3); see further 1094, Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 23–4, Arnott on Alexis fr. 129.7 *PCG*. For ἐν see 43n. For the medial caesura in 1091 see 992–7n.

1093–117 Teucer begins by concentrating on Ajax's constitutional position, rebutting Menelaus' attempt to portray him as a subordinate (1093–110). He expresses himself forcefully, showering Menelaus with angry questions (1097–1101), but without descending into vituperation; everything is to the point. He says nothing about Ajax's attack on the army, where a defence would be more of a challenge. Menelaus put so much emphasis on Ajax's alleged insubordination that Teucer justifiably concentrates on that, exploiting the rhetorical incapacity of his opponent. But the abusive turn which his speech takes at the end (1111–17n.) alienates even the chorus (1118–19n.), and prepares for stichomythia in which both parties trivialise the serious issues at the heart of the case (1120–41n.).

According to Barker (2004) 11–12, 14 'Ajax's dissent, as enacted by Teucer's defence, takes on an Athenian democratic resistance to the discipline and hierarchical authority associated with Spartan government . . . Teucer demonstrates the necessity and desirability of dissent as a democratic prerogative'. But (i) dissent is not in itself democratic, as an Athenian audience would have known: the *Iliad*, for example, is full of dissent, yet does not present a democratic world; (ii) Teucer is not resisting Menelaus' authority, but denying that such authority exists over Ajax; (iii) Teucer's argument, that Menelaus was not Ajax's commander because the latter sailed as a commander in his own right, is redolent not of democracy but of quarrels among aristocrats; (iv) nothing specifically associates Teucer with Athens.

1093–6 οὐκ ἄν ποτ', ἄνδρες, ἄνδρα θαυμάσαιμι' ἔτι, | ὅς μηδὲν ὦν γοναῖσιν εἶθ' ἁμαρτάνει, | ὅθ' οἱ δοκοῦντες εὐγενεῖς πεφυκέναι | τοιαῦθ' ἁμαρτάνουσιν ἐν λόγοις ἔπη. 'Never again, gentlemen, would I be amazed at a man of low birth who commits an offence, when those who are reputedly noble make such blunders in their speech.' Teucer implies the principle of *noblesse oblige*, for which cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 411–12 ὅταν γὰρ αἰσχρὰ τοῖσιν ἐσθλοῖσιν δοκῇ, | ἥ κάρτα δόξει τοῖς κακοῖς γ' εἶναι καλὰ; for virtue as a hereditary feature of noble families cf. Eur. fr. 232.1 *TrGF* ἐν τοῖς τέκνοις γὰρ ἀρετὴ τῶν εὐγενῶν, Dover (1974) 93–4 with n. 17. Plain ἄνδρες is found in addresses to a chorus at

1318, *Ant.* 162, and *Phil.* 974. Teucer contemptuously addresses his first words to them rather than to Menelaus (cf. *El.* 372–5n., adding Stevens on Eur. *Andr.* 319–23); contrast the chorus’s direct engagement (1091–2).

For the repetition *ἄνδρες, ἄνδρα* see 1071–2n. For *μηδὲν ὦν* (766–9n.) with a qualifying phrase (*γοναῖσιν*) cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 598 *τὸν οὐδὲν ἐς μάχην*. For *εἴτα* coordinating participle and verb see 1091–2n. *ἀμαρτάνει* could be emended to *οἰ* (Hartung, p. 207) or *–η* (Stobaeus 4.29.32 = v 716.19 W–H); see 1073–6n. In *ἀμαρτάνουσιν* *ἔπη* the noun is a cognate accusative replacing the expected *ἀμαρτήματα* (cf. 1107–8, Moorhouse 40). The repetition *ἐν λόγοις ἔπη* is paralleled by Thuc. 3.67.6 *λόγοι ἔπεσι κοσμηθέντες*; we do not require *λόγοις ἔπει* (*coni.* Markland (pre-1776)).

1097–8 *ἄγ’, εἴπ’ ἅπ’ ἀρχῆς αὖθις, ἧ σὺ φῆς ἄγειν | τόνδ’ ἄνδρ’ Ἀχαιοῖς δεῦρο σύμμαχον λαβών*; ‘Come, tell me again from the beginning, are you saying that you took this man and brought him here as an ally to the Argives?’ Close repetition of 1052–3 expresses Teucer’s incredulity (especially *ἄγειν*, which stands for an original imperfect: Moorhouse 208), as does *ἧ σὺ* (cf. *OC* 863 *ὦ φθέγγμ’ ἀναιδές, ἧ σὺ γὰρ ψεύσεις ἑμοῦ*; *El.* 1222, 1355, Aesch. *Ag.* 1542, Eur. *Or.* 1591, *Cycl.* 111). The sarcastic emphasis falls on *ἧ σὺ φῆς ἄγειν*: Ajax was an ally, but it was not Menelaus who brought him to Troy.

For examples of *ἅπ’ ἀρχῆς* in verse and prose see Diggle (1984a) 52 = (1994) 277. For the vocalism and accent of *φῆς* see 791n. *τόνδ’* in L was conjectured by Markland (pre-1776); other manuscripts have *τόν*, but the demonstrative is probably preferable as providing livelier sense. The reverse corruption occurs at *OC* 44 and 78.

1099 *οὐκ αὐτὸς ἐξέπλευσεν ὥς αὐτοῦ κρατῶν*; ‘Didn’t he set sail of his own accord, as his own master?’ In other accounts Odysseus was unwilling to go to Troy (cf. *Cypria* p. 70 *GEF*, Aesch. *Ag.* 841). For *αὐτός* cf. *OR* 341, Page on Eur. *Med.* 729, Shackleton Bailey (1956) 114.

1100–1 *ποῦ σὺ στρατηγεῖς τοῦδε; ποῦ δὲ σοὶ λεῶν | ἔξεστ’ ἀνάσσειν ὦν ὁδ’ ἡγεῖτ’ οἴκοθεν*; ‘How is it that you command this man? How can you command the men that he led from his home?’ Repeated for emphasis, *ποῦ* is ‘expressive of indignant incredulity’ (Mastrorade on Eur. *Phoen.* 547–8): cf. *OR* 390 *ἐπεὶ φέρ’ εἰπέ, ποῦ σὺ μάντις εἶ σαφής*; Stevens on Eur. *Andr.* 591, L. Parker on Eur. *Alc.* 1075. *λεῶν* is only in D^{pc}, and was proposed by Housman (1892) 48 = (1972) 1 226 (citing Arcadius 1 407.18 Lentz = 107.16–18 Schmidt). Most manuscripts have *λεῶν*, with incorrect accentuation (K–B 1 407 (4)); the unmetrical variant *λαῶν* shows further corruption arising from unfamiliarity with the Attic genitive plural. *λαός* of the army, regular in epic (cf. Katz (2004) 205), recurs at *Phil.* 1243 *ξύμπας Ἀχαιῶν λαός*. Teucer’s words presuppose the idea that each *λαός* has a single leader, a familiar epic idea (cf. Haubold (2000) 154 with n. 28).

Transmitted ἡγεῖτ' apparently breaks Porson's Law, according to which tragic trimeters do not end in the metrical form —|—υ—. Elision at the word break seems to allow such breaches, however (thus Erfurdt). Renehan (1992) 367–9 shows that the often stated view that such elisions are permissible only when the elided word has only two syllables is based on insufficient evidence (cf. West (1982) 85; *contra* Diggle (1984b) 67 = (1994) 314). For parallels cf. *Phil.* 22, *Eur. Hcl.* 529, *Ion* 1 (reading νῶτοις οὐρανόν: Irvine (1997)). ἡγεῖτ' also coordinates well with ἀνάσσειν. If we are to emend, ἦγεν (*coni.* Porson (pre-1808b) 194) is most probable; ἦγετ' (*coni.* Anonymous A (1810) 396) is an unwelcome middle, while ἦγαγ' (P, *coni.* Elmsley (1814) 479) is palaeographically unlikely.

1102 Σπάρτης ἀνάσσων ἦλθες, οὐχ ἡμῶν κρατῶν 'You came as Sparta's leader, not in charge of us.' Menelaus is similarly rebuffed thrice in Euripides: fr. 723 *TrGF* (*Telephus*, spoken by Agamemnon) Σπάρτην ἔλαχες, κείνην κόσμει | τὰς δὲ Μυκλήνας ἡμεῖς ἰδίᾳ, *Andr.* 582 (by Peleus) οὐχ ἄλις σοι τῶν κατὰ Σπάρτην κρατεῖν;., *Or.* 1660–1 Ἀργούς δ' Ὀρέστην, Μενέλεως, ἔα κρατεῖν, | ἔλθων δ' ἀνάσσε Σπαρτιάτιδος χθονός.

1103–4 οὐδ' ἔσθ' ὅπου σοὶ τόνδε κοσμήσαι πλέον | ἀρχῆς ἔκειτο θεσμός ἦ καὶ τῷδε σέ. 'There is no established right of command which allows you to rule him, or him, for his part, to rule you.' κόσμος is associated with obedience at *Ant.* 660, 677, and *Phil.* [387], while the Atridae are κοσμήτορες λαῶν in Homer (*Il.* 1.16 etc.; cf. Diller (1956) 53 = (1971) 79–80). For ἦ καὶ in this sense see Denniston 299.

[1105–6 ὕπαρχος ἄλλων δεῦρ' ἐπλευσας, οὐχ ὄλων | στρατηγός, ὥστ' Αἶαντος ἡγεῖσθαί ποτε.] 'You sailed here as the lieutenant of others, not as general of the whole, so as to have authority over Ajax.' Schneidewin¹ and (1849) 474 suggests that these lines are interpolated (*prob.* Reeve (1973) 162). They contain three problems. (i) ὄλων cannot be neuter (*summa rerum*), since parallels for ὄλᾱ standing for τὰ ὄλᾱ are lacking, or masculine, since ὄλοι standing for πάντες is not paralleled in tragedy, where ὄλος is attested at *OR* 1136, *Phil.* 480, *OC* 479, *Eur. Cycl.* 217, *Phoen.* [1131], fr. 1041.2 *TrGF*; also *Tr. Adesp.* fr. 619.9, Chaeremon 71 F 30 (ὄλως), and 36.1 (corrupt). ὄλος tends to replace πᾶς in later Greek, and is already found about eighteen times in Aristophanes where πᾶς would mean the same; eight are spoken by women (thus Willi (2003) 192), and many of the rest by low-status men, which suggests a colloquialism. The solecism betrays the interpolator.

(ii) Having firmly and precisely delimited Menelaus' authority to Sparta, Teucer can scarcely bestow on him the command of unspecified 'others'. (Compare [856–8], another weak repetition of an immediately preceding idea.) The deletion also restores the connexion between 1102–4 and 1107–8.

‘You rule Sparta, not us. You can’t command him any more than he can you. No, rule your own people’ is a better train of thought than ‘You rule Sparta, not us. You can’t command him any more than he can you. You rule others, not everyone. No, rule your own people.’

(iii) ὑπαρχος, denoting a subordinate commander (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1432, its only other tragic occurrence), contrasts with στρατηγός. But elsewhere Teucer does not dispute that Menelaus is a στρατηγός (1109), only that his στρατηγία does not extend over Ajax (1100). Calling him a ὑπαρχος and not a στρατηγός introduces a quite separate argument inconsistent with the rest of the speech (thus Fraenkel (1977) 33, (2007a) 58–9).

1107–8 ἀλλ’ ὥνπερ ἄρχεις ἄρχε, καὶ τὰ σέμν’ ἔπη | κόλαζ’ ἐκείνους. ‘No, rule the men that you rule, and chastise them with those haughty words of yours.’ For ἀλλά introducing an imperative see n. on 194a. Teucer’s command is ‘tragic diction for “mind your own business”’ (Taplin (1977) 400): cf. *OC* 839 μὴ ’πίτασσε’ ἃ μὴ κρατεῖς, Aesch. *Eum.* 574 ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων, ὦν ἔχεις αὐτὸς κράτει, Hom. *Il.* 1.179–80, 1.295–6, 15.197–8 θυγατέρεσσιν γάρ τε καὶ υἷαςι κέρδιον εἶη | ἐκπάγλοις ἐπέεσσιν ἐνισσέμεν, οὓς τέκεν αὐτός, Theocr. 15.90 πασόμενος ἐπίτασσε’ Συρακοσίαις ἐπιτάσσεις with Gow, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.102, Virg. *Aen.* 1.139–41, Daphitas 129–30 *FGE*. For twin accusatives with κόλαζε (with cognate ἔπη: 1093–6n.) cf. *OR* 339–40 ἔπη | κλύων, ἃ νῦν σὺ τήνδ’ ἀτιμάξεις πόλιν; Hom. *Il.* 19.20 αὐτίκα μητέρα ἦν ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, K–G 1 320, Bruhn §53.11, S–D II 79–80.

1108–10 τόνδε δ’, εἴτε μὴ σὺ φῆς | εἴθ’ ἄτερος στρατηγός, εἰς ταφὰς ἐγὼ | θήσω δικαίως, οὐ τὸ σὸν δέισας στόμα. ‘But as for this man, whether you or the other general forbid it, I will lay him in the grave, justly, with no fear of what you say.’ For the vocalism and accent of φῆς see 791n. For ταφὰς see 1089–90n. δικαίως ‘coming last, effectively and idiomatically qualifies the entire preceding clause’ (FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 812–14). στόμα stands for the whole person, as at *OR* 671–2 τὸ γὰρ σὸν, οὐ τὸ τοῦδ’, ἐποικτιρῶ στόμα | ἔλεινόν, *Ant.* 997 ὡς ἐγὼ τὸ σὸν φρίσσω στόμα (the object of emotion in each case).

1111–17 Reichard (1880) 25–6 deletes these lines; Wecklein [*testibus* Ll–J/W; not in 6th edn] excises only 1111–14. Reichard points to the difficulty of the antithesis in 1111–13: opposing ‘Helen’ and ‘the oath’ does not work, since the oath was sworn to defend Helen, while 1115–17 are an inept repetition of 1108–10, which themselves make a suitable ending to the speech. Fraenkel notes how 1109–10 correspond with the conclusion of Menelaus’ *rhesis* at 1089–90, comparing the matching conclusions at *Ant.* 1031–2 ~ 1045–7 and Hdt. 4.126 ~ 127.4; Macleod *ap.* Fraenkel observes that 523–4 pick up 479–80 in the opposing *rhesis* of Tecmessa and Ajax. Ll–J/W (*So.*) pronounce the lines

‘not unworthy of S.’, and ask ‘Can 1109–10 have been delivered slowly and deliberately, so that the audience will have seen that they answer 1089–90, and the rest have been added only after a pause?’, which all but concedes that they are out of place. Nevertheless, I retain them, for the following reasons:

(i) There are no linguistic or metrical problems in the lines (contrast e.g. [918–19], [966–70], [1028], [1035], [1105–6]), which contain three locations which seem distinctively tragic or even Sophoclean (1113 ἐπώμοτος, 1114 ἡξίου, 1116–17 τοῦ . . . σοῦ ψόφος | οὐκ ἂν στραφείην, on which see nn.).

(ii) The opposition between Helen and the oath makes rhetorical sense. Teucer distinguishes between soldiers with allegiance to the Atreids, and Ajax, an independent warrior whose loyalty was not to them, but to the principle of the oath. Helen herself is not named, and the emphasis is really on Menelaus (cf. τῆς σῆς οὐνέκ’ . . . γυναικός and σοῦ δ’ οὐδέν, enclosing the reference to the oath). Teucer expands the point made at 1097–1104, 1107–8, and gives it a more personal, aggressive twist in keeping with the new turn in his rhetoric (see (iv) below).

(iii) *Rhesis* need not be balanced in the way identified by Fraenkel. For example, Teucer’s speech at 1266–1315 deals with the final point of Agamemnon’s preceding speech (1259–63) in its central section (1298–1305), not its conclusion (on which see (iv) below). Fraenkel’s point might strengthen an argument that was strong on other grounds, but cannot itself justify the excision.

(iv) The chorus’s words at 1118–19 make better sense with 1111–17 than without them. Up to 1110 Teucer has forcibly stated the limits of Menelaus’ authority, but without rancour (his references to οἱ δοκοῦντες εὐγενεῖς πεφυκέναι (1095) and τὰ σέμν’ ἔπη (1107) scarcely count as such). If his speech ended here, its language and tone would not deserve the chorus’s disapproval. Only in 1111–17 does Teucer deploy *ad hominem* abuse, contemptuously describing Menelaus’ followers as οἱ πόνου πολλοῦ πλέω (1112) and Menelaus himself as a ‘nobody’ (1114) whose words are mere ψόφος (1116). These taunts motivate the chorus’s distaste in a way that the resolute statement of defiance in 1008–10 would not. If we find 1111–17 to be ‘coarse repetition’ (thus Radermacher: ‘Die Verse . . . wiederholen vergrößert den Gedanken 1108–10’), that is the point: Teucer spoils a good case through unnecessary vituperation (cf. 1386–92). The aggressive conclusion is also paralleled in Teucer’s speech at 1266–1315: personal throughout, this becomes still more so at 1313–15, with its closing threat. Cf. Electra’s speech at *El.* 558–609, which begins with convincing arguments and ends with menaces; here too a usually sympathetic chorus rebukes the speaker (610–11).

(v) Including these lines, Teucer’s speech is twenty-three lines long, after a speech from Menelaus lasting thirty-eight lines. Teucer’s speech is somewhat shorter because he has another one to deliver in response to Agamemnon’s

brother in the next episode (1040–1162n.). But if we delete 1111–17, Teucer's speech lasts for only sixteen lines, well under half the length of Menelaus', and considerably shorter than any other *agon* speech in S. or Euripides (M. Lloyd (1992) 5). Such imbalance and brevity would frustrate generic expectations for no good reason.

1111–14 οὐ γάρ τι τῆς σῆς οὐνεκ' ἐστρατεύσατο | γυναικός, ὥσπερ οἱ πόνου πολλοῦ πλέω, | ἀλλ' οὐνεχ' ὀρκων οἷσιν ἦν ἐπώμοτος, | σοῦ δ' οὐδέν· οὐ γάρ ἡξίου τοὺς μηδένας. 'For he did not go to war because of your wife, like those full of much toil, but because of the oaths to which he was bound, and not because of you; for he had no regard for nobodies.' The oath sworn by the suitors of Helen to assist in her rescue should she be abducted first occurs at [Hes.] fr. 204.78–85 M–W and Stes. fr. 190 *PMGF*; cf. S. *Phil.* 72, fr. 144 *TrGF*, Eur. *IA* [55–69] (with Stockert on 57 ff.), 391–4, Thuc. 1.9.1.

οἱ πόνου πολλοῦ πλέω denotes the common soldiers as opposed to their leaders: cf. Eur. *Andr.* 695–6 οὐ τῶν πονούντων τοῦργον ἡγοῦνται τόδε, | ἀλλ' ὁ στρατηγὸς τὴν δόκησιν ἄρνυται. Usually πλέως is accompanied by a noun such as μωρία (745–6n.) or ἐπιστήμη (*Ant.* 721), which corresponds to an obvious adjectival idea (perhaps also Com. Adesp. fr. 263 *PCG* ἀγροῦ πλέως, defined by Hesychius as ἀγροικίας πλήρης). This expression seems rather to correspond to a verbal notion, οἱ πολλὰ πονοῦντες; similarly, Cratinus' description of κόμη as ἀτιμίας πλέως (fr. 10 *PCG*) appears to stand for κόμη πολλὰ ἀτιμασθεῖσα. Perhaps this extended use of πλέως had a colloquial ring.

For the corruption of οὐνεκα to εἶνεκ' in **1** see 328–9n. ἐπώμοτος (thus most manuscripts) is attested at *Tr.* 427 and 1188, and a Cretan inscription from the seventh or sixth century (*IC* iv 8ef), but not in later Greek. The variant ἐνώμοτος is absent from classical Greek, but common in the Imperial period. This distribution suggests that ἐπ– is original. Corruption to ἐν–, already easy given the respective prevalence of the two words in later times, was assisted by the existence of the adjective ἐνορκος (Dawe, *STS* 1 165; cf. especially *Phil.* 72 σὺ μὲν ἐπέπλευκας οὐτ' ἐνορκος οὐδενί, from the same context), as well as ἐνωμοτία and ἐνωμοστάρχης (frequent in the historians, denoting a division of the Spartan army). Lanza *ap.* Lanza and Fort (1987) 222, (1991) 29–30 supports ἐν– by referring to *Suda* ε 1410 (II 289.20 Adler) ἐνώμοτος· ἐνοχος τοῖς ὀρκοῖς, but this merely shows that the corruption antedates the composition of that encyclopaedia. At Eur. *Med.* 737 ἐνώμοτος is also a corrupt variant, this time for ἀνώμοτος.

ἄξιόω 'honour' is paralleled by Aesch. *Ag.* 903, Eur. *Held.* 918, Men. *Sam.* 598; cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. 1 2. For τοὺς μηδένας see 766–9n.

1115–16 πρὸς ταῦτα πλείους δεῦρο κήρυκας λαβὼν | καὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν ἦκε· 'In the face of that get more heralds, and the general, and come back here!' For minatory πρὸς ταῦτα see 971n. Agamemnon *qua* general is distinguished

from Menelaus by Menelaus himself at 1050 and by Teucer at 1386–7; this description is thus neither an indication of spuriousness, nor a cutting reminder of Menelaus' subordinate status.

1116–17 τοῦ δὲ σοῦ ψόφου | οὐκ ἂν στραφείην, ἕως ἂν ᾦς οἶός περ εἴ. 'As for that bluster of yours, it won't make me turn, while you're the sort of man you are.' Teucer concludes by focussing not on the argument but on Menelaus' character. ψόφ– is strongly attested in S.'s satyr-plays (*Ichneutae* fr. 314 *TrGF* lines 145, 157, 160, and 168, *Inachus* 269c.22, and *Salmoneus* 537.1), but found only once in a tragedy (*Acrisius* fr. 61.2), and once in a play of unknown genre (828f); the latter passages contain colloquial language (respectively ὑῶ and παπαῖ). This distribution suggests that S. regarded ψόφ– as colloquial too. Aeschylus does not have it, while Euripides uses it freely in satyr-play (*Cycl.* 443) and tragedy (*Her.* 78, 229, *IT* 1308, *Or.* 137, *Ba.* 638, 687, perhaps fr. 25.2 (*coni.*)); common in comedy, it is also found in prose. The word denotes inarticulate noise, such as the opening of a door (often in comedy), and is occasionally used of human speech. Here the idea is of blustering pomposity: cf. *Ar. Nub.* 1367 (of Aeschylus) ψόφου πλέων, ἀξύστατον, στόμφακα, κρημνοποιόν, *Ran.* 492 τὸν ψόφον τῶν ῥημάτων, [*Alexis*] fr. 25.8–9 *PCG* ἀρεταὶ δὲ πρεσβεῖαί τε καὶ στρατηγίαί | κόμπαι κενοὶ ψοφοῦσιν ἀντ' ὀνειράτων, *Men.* fr. 743 *PCG* πᾶς ὁ μὴ φρονῶν | ἀλαζονεῖα καὶ ψόφοις ἀλίσκεται.

For passive στρέφω of changing one's mind cf. *Ti.* 1134 κἂν σοῦ στραφείη θυμός, εἰ τὸ πᾶν μάθοις; for the genitive of cause cf. *OR* 728 ποίας μερίμνης τοῦθ' ὑποστραφεῖς λέγεις;, *Phil.* 598–9 τοῦδ' . . . ἐπεστρέφοντο, *Bruhn* §38, *Moorhouse* 65. Instead of τοῦ δὲ **r** has καὶ τοῦ, but the opposition marked by δέ is essential.

ἕως (*coni.* *Musgrave*) glosses ὥς in a few manuscripts. For the corruption cf. *Phil.* 1330 (where ἕως keeps a foothold, in Q), *El.* 571 (n.), *OC* 1361, *Pl. Resp.* 423a ἕως (v.l. ὥς) ἂν ἡ πόλις σοι οἰκῇ σωφρόνως ὥς ἄρτι ἐτάχθη; for glosses preserving the truth see 146n. *Pl. Phaedr.* 243e ἕωσπερ ἂν ᾦς ὅς εἰ parallels the sense. ὥς would mean 'so that . . .', nonsensically; Campbell attempts to keep it in all four passages via semantic contortions analysed and rejected by *Moorhouse* 296. The alternative ἔστ' (*S, coni.* *Reiske* (1753) 8) supposes a less plausible corruption.

1118–19 οὐδ' αὖ τοιαύτην γλῶσσαν ἐν κακοῖς φιλῶ· | τὰ σκληρὰ γάρ τοι, κἂν ὑπέρδικ' ᾦ, δάκνει. 'Nor again do I favour language like that in the midst of troubles; harsh words cause grief, be they ever so just.' In a startling intervention, the chorus, far from offering unconditional support to Teucer in his struggle (which is theirs too), openly condemns his ferocity. Cf. the chorus's remarks at *El.* 610–11 (with my n., and 1111–17n. above). οὐδ' αὖ emphasises that the chorus are unenthusiastic about both speeches (cf. 1091–2). This mirrors and guides the audience's response.

The opposite, though related, thought occurs at *OR* 682/3 δάπτει . . . καὶ τὸ μὴ ἵνδικον. For γλῶσσαν qualified as to size cf. fr. 929.3 *TiGF* πολλήν γλῶσσαν ἐκχέας, Ar. *Nub.* 1018 γλῶτταν μεγάλην. For ἐν κακοῖς see 532n. Intensifying ὑπερ- precedes -δικ- at Aesch. *Ag.* 1396 τάδ' ἄν δικαίως ᾔην, ὑπερδίκως μὲν οὖν and Pind. *P.* 10.44 ὑπέρδικον Νέμεσιν. The verb δάκνω in the sense 'cause grief to' is common in poetry (Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 323–5) and prose.

B. Heath (1762) 11 attributes these lines to the chorus. Manuscripts give 1118 to Menelaus and 1119 to Teucer, but οὐδ' αὖ is senseless in the mouth of Menelaus, while Teucer would hardly call his own words σκληρά. The scholia (1118a = p. 227 Chr.) read ὑποτίθησι τῷ Τεύκρῳ παύσασθαι τῆς κατηγορίας, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοιοῦτῳ καιρῷ, ἐν ᾧ εὐεπιβούλευτός ἐστιν. As Pearson first noticed, this implies a text in which the chorus delivers both lines; Menelaus could hardly be the subject of ὑποτίθησι, as if he wanted to offer helpful advice to Teucer.

1120–41 Stichomythia concluding an *agon* rarely resolves the dispute (cf. M. Lloyd (1992) 15); neither party emerges well from this exchange. Teucer's failure to rise above Menelaus' opening *ad hominem* attack keeps the focus on bowmen, not burial (1120–3n.). A fresh taunt from Menelaus (1124) stirs Teucer to a mention of justice (1125n.), which is followed by the debate's first substantive (if basic) point: how, Menelaus asks, is it just for Ajax to kill me (1126n.)? Rather than answer the question or develop the thought, Teucer finds fault with his choice of words (1127n.); Menelaus' reply leads to the (extraordinarily late) first mention of divine law in the *agon* (1128–31n.), but this too soon dissolves into semantic quibbling from Teucer (1133n.). After unsubstantiated (and hotly denied) charges from Teucer about the conduct of the Judgment of the Arms (1135–7n.), the debate ends with matching threats (1138–9) and incompatible, irreconcilable declarations about the burial (1140–1). If anything, Teucer comes out marginally worse. Like the chorus (1118–19n), the audience may sympathise with his cause, while thinking that he lacks the temperament and ability to present and defend it successfully.

Teucer begins by answering Menelaus, before they switch roles at about 1127–8. By the end Teucer is again answering Menelaus, or rather turning his attacks back on him (1138–41); this leads into the exchange of fables, where Menelaus goes first. This imperceptible shift through the stichomythia, useful in itself to create variety, reveals the incompetence of the pair in both making and responding to arguments.

The scholium containing the general condemnation of the second part of the play has a more specific complaint about this passage: τὰ τοιαῦτα σοφίσματα οὐκ οἰκεία τραγωδίας (Σ 1123 = 227 Chr.). Similar considerations, we may presume, led Van Deventer (1851) 49–54 to delete the whole passage ('de universa ista puerili altercatione quid sentiam exponere supersedeo',

p. 49), while Romeis (1863) 8–9 excises 1121–4, again on grounds of taste rather than style, language, or metre. Such criticisms miss the point that the lowering of the tone is a deliberate move, aimed at portraying the unattractiveness of the characters. See further Pfeiffer-Petersen (1996) 22–9. (Contrast M. Heath (1987) 206, who argues that ‘there is nothing frigid or “low” about these exchanges; they are entirely at home in the heroic world of epic, and of tragedy’. Coarse invective does feature in both genres, but it does not follow that it is not ‘low’, unless we assume that nothing in either genre can be colloquial; see however Bain (2007).)

1120–3 The valour of archers is sometimes called into question in epic and tragedy (Hom. *Il.* 11.385–95, 13.713–18, Eur. *Her.* 157–64). As well as purely literary antecedents, the attack on archers may have had particular relevance in a city in which the τοξόται were Scythian slaves charged with keeping public order (A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 923; they were purchased for this purpose about 450, however, and so perhaps after our play was performed), and whose chief foreign enemies specialised in this kind of warfare. See further Farron (2003), Papadopoulou (2005) 137–51, Kelly (2007) 263–4 (citing e.g. Hom. *Il.* 21.482–3).

1120 ὁ τοξότης ἔοικεν οὐ σμικρὸν φρονεῖν. ‘The bowman appears to have no small thoughts.’ Menelaus does not deign to address Teucer directly, while ἔοικεν is sarcastic: Teucer has made his attitude clear enough. The definite article (cf. Aesch. fr. 60, 61 *TrGF*, Eur. *Trö.* 424) has a scornful tone: cf. 1289, Svensson (1937) 22–3, Davies on *Tr.* 541–2. σμικρὸν (*coni.* Anonymous B (1811) 139; *nol.* Lobeck) is in L and ‘no doubt’ (Dawe, *STS* 1 165) *Zc*^{ac}. Majority σμικρά vitiates prosody; μικρὸν (GQ) will be an error. οὐ σμικρὸν is equivalent to μέγα (386n.) through litotes (parallels at FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 958); Teucer picks up the expression at 1125 (n.).

1121 οὐ γὰρ βανανσον τὴν τέχνην ἐκτησάμην. ‘Yes, because it was no workman’s trade that I learned.’ Occupations involving manual labour (except for farming) could be condemned as ‘banausic’: cf. Xen. *Oec.* 6.53 συναπιδουκνίζομεν . . . ταῖς πόλεσι τὰς βαναυσικὰς καλουμένας τέχνας, ὅτι καὶ τὰ σώματα καταλυμαίνεσθαι δοκοῦσι καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς καταγνύουσι, the τεκμήριον σαφέστατον of which is the claim that such practitioners, in contrast to farmers, would not be as willing to defend their country (for further such attacks see Nightingale (1995) 55–9, Cuomo (2007) 9–10 with nn. 13, 15, Oakley on Livy 8.20.4 *opificum* . . . *volgus et sellularii, minime militiae idoneum genus*). In classical Greek the stem is elsewhere confined to prose (Nightingale, p. 56 n. 94), where it frequently qualifies τέχνη (cf. Pl. *Resp.* 522b, *Alc.* 1 131b, Arist. *Met.* 996a33–4); was it too technical for poetry?

1122 μέγ' ἂν τι κομπάσειας, ἄσπιδ' εἰ λάβοις. 'Great indeed would be your boast, if you took up a shield.' The shield, essential accessory of the hand-to-hand fighter, is opposed to the bow at Eur. *Her.* 159–60; in the *Iliad* Teucer relies on Ajax's shield for protection, running under it πᾶσις ὡς ὑπὸ μητέρα (8.271). For intensifying τι see 28n.

1123 κἂν ψιλὸς ἀρκέσαιμι σοί γ' ὥπλισμένῳ. 'Even with little protection I would be a match for you fully armed.'

1124 ἡ γλῶσσά σου τὸν θυμὸν ὡς δεινὸν τρέφει. 'What a fearsome spirit is nourished by your tongue!' The gloss μέγαν, which entered the text in a few manuscripts (28n.), was probably aimed at showing that μέγ' . . . φρονεῖν in 1125 picks up θυμὸν . . . δεινόν here. For τρέφω cf. *Ant.* 1089–90 τρέφειν τὴν γλῶσσαν ἡσυχαιτέραν | τὸν νοῦν τ' ἀμείνω, Tr. Adesp. fr. 18 *TrGF* σιωπὴ δ' ἐστὶ τοῦ θυμοῦ τροφή, Moussy (1969) 71–2.

1125 ξὺν τῷ δικαίῳ γὰρ μέγ' ἔξεστιν φρονεῖν. 'Yes, for a man may be proud with justice on his side.' Teucer at last raises the notion of justice, but only to defend his own high-minded attitude, not the rights of the dead man. Each participant in the *agon* has now proudly admitted that he μέγα φρονεῖ, a phrase not normally predicated of oneself (1087–8n.).

1126 δίκαια γὰρ τόνδ' εὐτυχεῖν κτείναντά με; 'So it's just that this man should enjoy good fortune after killing me?' For the predicative neuter plural adjective see 887/8–890n. γὰρ introduces a question which 'is rhetorical, . . . often ironical; and implies that the speaker throws doubt on the grounds of the previous speaker's words' (Denniston 77); cf. 1130, Aesch. *Cho.* 909 πατροκτονοῦσα γὰρ ξυνοικήσεις ἐμοί; Aorist κτείναντα 'represents the near-event more vividly' (Cropp on *IT* 992); cf. ἔκτεινά σ' at Eur. *Ion.* 1291, 1500 (Creusa to Ion), *Andr.* 633–4 (κτείνεις), S. *OR* 534, Bianor *A.Pl.* 276.4 = 1766 *GP* κτεινόμεθ' ἀνθρώποις, ἰχθύσι σφζόμεθα (of Arion), K–G 1 166–7, Shackleton Bailey (1956) 76.

1127 κτείναντα; δεινόν γ' εἶπας, εἰ καὶ ζῆς θανών. 'Killing? It's a wondrous thing you say, if you are alive even after you have been killed.' Teucer deliberately misinterprets Menelaus' statement. Juxtaposition of terms for life and death (cf. 1385, Theogn. 1230 τεθνηκώς ζωῶ φθεγγόμενος στόματι, Fehling (1969) 281, Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 926) highlights the paradox. Indignant δεινόν γε (*El.* 341n.) is preceded by astonished repetition of an offending word (cf. Denniston 129, Diggle (1981a) 50; Lowe (1973) 43–4 with n. 11 compares Ar. *Lys.* 529 ὑμεῖς ἡμᾶς; δεινόν γε λέγεις κοῦ τλητὸν ἔμοιγε). Some manuscripts corrupt γ' to the nonsensical τ', which others omit (cf. 1069–70n.). εἰ has become ἡ in **r**, which 'would turn a sarcastic reply into more of a schoolboy taunt' (Dawe, *STS* 1 165).

1128–31 The gods have been absent from the *agon*, except at 1060, where Menelaus attributes his salvation to a θεός. In view of *Ant.* 450–70 this is a surprise (cf. e.g. Eur. *Suppl.* 18–19, 561–3, *Hel.* 1277 for denial of burial as an act of impiety), and symptomatic of Teucer’s failure to employ his most advantageous arguments. Even here the reference is brief and superficial, and the debate soon returns to triviality. Contrast the climactic position of this theme in Odysseus’ speech to Agamemnon (1343–4).

1128 θεός γάρ ἐκσώζει με, τῷδε δ’ οἴχομαι. ‘Yes, because the god is my deliverer; so far as his efforts are concerned, I’m dead.’ γάρ refers to a preceding individual word or phrase, in this case ζῆς (cf. 1320, Denniston 80). The present instead of the aorist marks ‘the continuance of the effect of the action after its performance’ (Moorhouse 183). The sense of τῷδε is owed to Pearson (1922) 127: see further Finglass (2009f) 342.

1129 μή νυν ἀτίμα θεούς, θεοῖς σεσωμένους. ‘Don’t then dishonour the gods, when it was by the gods that you were saved.’ Polypoton of θεός links the phrases (cf. FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 921), although the two words differ in prosody (cf. Seaford on Eur. *Cycl.* 231). νυν (giving the required inferential sense) and σεσωμένος for manuscript νῦν and σεσωσ– are owed to Lobeck’ (*tacite*) and Wecklein (691–2n.) respectively. ἀτιμάω is elsewhere absent from tragedy, but frequent in epic; since epicisms are common in this play, it should not be emended (with Elmsley (1814) 481–2) to ἀτίμου or ἀτιζε (so correctly Renehan (1976) 33).

1130 ἐγὼ γάρ ἄν ψέξαιμι δαιμόνων νόμους; ‘What? Would I find fault with the laws of the gods?’ For the idea that not burying the dead breaks divine law see 1128–31n. For the tone of γάρ see 1126n. In a few manuscripts νόμους has become γένος, under the influence of expressions like Aesch. *Sept.* 236 δαιμόνων τιμᾶν γένος, Eur. fr. 577.2 *TrGF* δαιμόνων γένος (thus Dawe, *STS* 1 165–6).

1131 εἰ τοὺς θανόντας οὐκ ἔξς θάπτειν παρών. ‘Yes, if you are here to forbid the burial of the dead.’ Lenting’s γ’ after θανόντας (on Eur. *Andr.* 887, p. 299) adds a particle sometimes found in affirmative answers contradicting a denial (Denniston 132; Menelaus’ question is a virtual denial), but not required in them. οὐκ, not μή, is found after εἰ because the statement is not really conditional (‘on the ground that . . .’: see Moorhouse 321–2). For παρών see 337–8n. (‘by your personal intervention’ – MD).

1132 τοὺς γ’ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ πολεμίους; οὐ γὰρ καλόν. ‘Yes, that of my own enemies. It is not right.’ For αὐτοῦ of the first person see Bruhn §78 (reading αὐτοῦ, but for the absence of aspiration see *El.* 285n.). Dobree (pre-1825) II 45 puts a question mark after καλόν (*prob.* LI-J/W, *ST*), but ‘οὐ καλόν is

appropriately used of what is vetoed, but the veto itself is not appropriately qualified by *καλόν* (MLW).

1133 ἡ σοὶ γὰρ Αἴας πολέμιος προὔστη ποτέ; ‘What? Did Ajax ever confront you as an enemy?’ Insofar as Ajax never confronted Menelaus in battle, he is better described as *ἐχθρός* than *πολέμιος*. But by focussing on Menelaus’ choice of language, Teucer squanders the chance to develop the key argument that even enemies deserve burial. He appears more interested in point-scoring than ethics. Interrogative ἡ γὰρ marks surprise (Denniston 284–5). For προὔστη with the dative in this sense see *El.* 979–80n.

1134 μισοῦντ’ ἐμίσει· καὶ σὺ τοῦτ’ ἠπίστασο. ‘He hated a man who hated him: you too were aware of this.’ Menelaus misses the obvious rejoinder that Ajax was a public enemy (thus Campbell, Winnington-Ingram (1980) 64 n. 20). His polyptoton, expressing mutual loathing (cf. *Pl. Leg.* 697d μισοῦντες μισοῦνται, [Aesch.] *PV* 970 οὕτως ὑβρίζειν τοὺς ὑβρίζοντας χρεών, *Pind. P.* 10.66 φιλέων φιλέοντ’, 4.284, Gygli-Wyss (1966) 63 nn. 3–4, Fehling (1969) 231, West on *Hes. Op.* 353), undermines his case by putting himself on the same level as his foe. The variant ἐμίσουν (‘I hated a man who hated me’) is weakly attested, and fits less well with 1133 and 1135. Imperfect ἠπίστασο is influenced by ἐμίσει, referring to when Ajax was alive; the minority variant ἐπίστασαι was encouraged by the fact that Teucer’s knowledge is in the present. The other minority variant, the imperative ἐπίστασο, is inferior because this is not a new piece of information.

1135–7 Ajax has already accused the Atridae of foul play at the Judgment (445–9). As in that passage, Teucer’s claim lacks specifics, and he fails to counter Menelaus’ denial (cf. Van Erp Taalman Kip (1996) 528). Agamemnon later refers to a majority verdict against Ajax (1242–3), which Teucer fails to contradict.

1135 κλέπτης γὰρ αὐτοῦ ψηφοποιὸς ἡύρέθης. ‘Yes, because you were found to have subverted the votes, to rob him’ (similarly Jebb). κλέπτης governs αὐτοῦ: just as κλέπτω can take an accusative of the person cheated or the thing of which s/he is cheated, so the objective genitive (Moorhouse 52–3) after κλέπτης can express either idea. The vagueness of ψηφοποιός (cf. Van Erp Taalman Kip (1996) 526–7) suggests that Teucer has no definite conception of his charge (cf. 446 ἔπραξαν). For ἡύρέθης (Dindorf³, for manuscript εὐ–) see 119–20n.

1136 ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς κοῦκ ἐμοὶ τόδ’ ἐσφάλῃ. ‘He suffered this defeat at the hands of the judges, not me.’ For κοῦκ where οὐκ would have done cf. *OC* 907–8 νῦν δ’ οὐσπερ αὐτὸς τοὺς νόμους εἰσῆλθ’ ἔχων, | τοῦτοισι κοῦκ ἄλλοισιν ἀρμοσθήσεται, 1369 ὑμεῖς δ’ ἅπ’ ἄλλου κοῦκ ἐμοῦ πεφύκατον (metrically

guaranteed). The variant οὐκ (cf. Wilkins on Eur. *Hold.* 733) is less well attested and more likely to result from error (removal of crasis: 39n.).

‘Forensic’ ἐν denotes the tribunal (cf. *Ant.* 459–60 ἐν θεοῖσι τὴν δίκην | δώσειν, Ar. *Nub.* 891–2, Antiph. 6.23, Pl. *Gorg.* 464d, *Leg.* 916b); S. uses the idiom outside a strictly judicial context at *OR* 677 ἐν δὲ τοῖσδ’ ἴσος, *OC* 1213–1213/14 σκαίοσυναν φυλάσσων ἐν ἐμοὶ κατὰ δὴλος ἔσται. Menelaus’ emphasis on the proper judicial context of Ajax’s defeat tells against the view that ‘the accusation by Teukros that the hearing was unfair appears to be tacitly accepted by Menelaus, who is concerned to exculpate himself rather than to justify the verdict’ (Carey (2007) 26).

1137 πόλλ’ ἂν καλῶς λάθρα σὺ κλέψειας κακά. ‘You could put a fair face on many a furtive villainy’ (Jebb, adapted). Meeting a denial, Teucer resorts to an accusation of general wickedness; the audience will conclude that his claims have no substance. For καλός of what is speciously honourable cf. *Ant.* 1046–7 (clever people fall into disaster) ὅταν λόγους | αἰσχροῦς καλῶς λέγωσι τοῦ κέρδους χάριν, Eur. *Hipp.* 984–5 τὸ μέντοι πρᾶγμ’, ἔχον καλοῦς λόγους, | εἴ τις διαπτύξειεν οὐ κακὸν τόδε. Only L has καλῶς; a polar error (235–6n.) produced κακῶς, encouraged by κακά later in the line, and perhaps by the apparent implausibility of Teucer’s predicating καλῶς of Menelaus’ conduct. For κλέπτω see 188–90n.

1138 τοῦτ’ εἰς ἀνίαν τοῦπος ἔρχεται τι. ‘That remark is going to cause pain for someone.’ Menelaus falls back on threats of physical violence. τις ‘referring obliquely to a definite person . . . is primarily menacing’ (Bond on Eur. *Her.* 747–8; cf. *El.* 1406n.); the usage may be colloquial (cf. Collard (2005a) 361–2).

1139 οὐ μᾶλλον, ὥς ἔοικεν, ἢ λυπήσομεν. ‘No more pain, I think, than I shall inflict.’ Teucer responds in kind, but is in no position to make good his threat.

1140 ἐν σοι φράσω· τόνδ’ ἐστὶν οὐχὶ θαπτέον. ‘One thing I’ll tell you: this man must not be buried.’ ἐν σοι φράσω conveys emphatic antagonism; Fraenkel (1977) 35 calls it ‘very crude’, but such a nuance is absent from Eur. fr. 245.8 *TrGF* (cited 1089–90n.), S. *Tr.* 154 ἐν δ’, οἷον οὕτω πρόσθεν, αὐτίκ’ ἔξερω, Ar. *Av.* 1304, 1531 ἐν δέ σοι λέγω (paratragic: see Dunbar), Ar. fr. 504.2 *PCG* ἐν δέ σοι φράσω, Thuc. 3.40.4 ἐν . . . ξυνελών λέγω. A sentence beginning with ἐν is often explained by a sentence in asyndeton: see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 715–16.

1141 σὺ δ’ ἀντακούση τοῦθ’ ἐν, ὥς τεθάψεται. ‘But you’ll hear this one thing in reply: that he shall be buried.’ Teucer’s reply mirrors Menelaus’ language (σοι ~ σὺ δ’, ἐν ~ τοῦθ’ ἐν, οὐχὶ θαπτέον ~ τεθάψεται; also φράσω ~ ἀντακούση). Dawe, *STS* 1 167, compares *OR* 547–8 (Κρ.) τοῦτ’ αὐτὸ νῦν μου

πρῶτ' ἄκουσον ὡς ἔρω. | (Οι.) τοῦτ' αὐτὸ μή μοι φράζ', ὅπως οὐκ εἴ κακός;
cf. also Eur. *Suppl.* 566–71.

Manuscripts divide evenly between σὺ δ' and ἄλλ'. The *utrum in alterum* argument applies both ways: original ἄλλ' has become σὺ δ' in a Gnomology at *El.* 1298, while in the secondary tradition at *OR* 54 and *Ant.* 563 intrusive ἄλλὰ displaces other particles. (Aesch. *Eum.* 303, cited by Dawe, *STS* 1 166, is irrelevant, since there the offending initial ἄλλ' will have been influenced by ἄλλὰ later in the same line; cf. *Phil.* 950, where original line-initial ἄλλ' has disappeared for the same reason.) Since the discovery of L most editors have printed ἄλλ', but σὺ δ' gives a more forceful reply to 1140 (see previous paragraph).

While ἀντακούω 'is found in contexts both of confrontation and of mild reply' (Wilkins on Eur. *Held.* 1014), the former is relevant here (for which Wilkins cites *OR* 544, Aesch. *Eum.* 198, Eur. *Hec.* 321, *Suppl.* 569).

τοῦθ' ἐν for transmitted τοῦτον is owed to Valckenaer (pre-1775) and Pierson (pre-1759) 197 recto. The paradosis would have to be justified as a proleptic construction (cf. K–G II 577–9). But as Dawe, *STS* 1 166–7, points out, in this idiom the proleptic element is usually semantically as well as syntactically prominent; to his examples add e.g. *Phil.* 573–4 ἄλλὰ τόνδε μοι πρῶτον φράσον | τίς ἐστίν ('But this man, tell me first who he is'), 444 τοῦτον οἶσθ' εἰ ζῶν κυρεῖ; ('Do you know about him, if he's still alive?'). Such prominence scarcely suits τοῦτον here (as the literal translation 'you will have my reply about him, that he shall be buried', offered by Moorhouse 48, indicates). The minority variant τοῦθ' will not reflect the truth; more likely, someone unable to construe τοῦτον put it in the neuter (probably subconsciously, since the change is metrically impossible). Other remedies (τοῦτό γ' Hartung, τοῦθ' ὅπως Dawe') fail to bring in the attractive numeral.

τεθάψεται gives a closing emphatic flourish: 'a forceful or emphatic future is achieved by speaking of the act as already accomplished in the future' (Moorhouse 202, citing e.g. *OC* 861 καὶ τοῦτο νῦν πεπράξεται).

1142–58 'In archaic and classical Greek literature the fable is used in addressing a particular person, as a means of commenting on his behaviour or situation' (West on Hes. *Op.* 202–12, with examples). They are rare in tragedy and epic, however, presumably being too homely for these genres. Similarly, while fables are admissible in rhetorical theory, they are largely absent from surviving speeches (Meuli (1954) 87–8 = (1975) II 754–6); orators may have regarded the form as too low to enhance their rhetoric (Livy 2.32.8–12 describes how Menenius Agrippa, as an *orator ad plebem*, employs a fable, speaking *prisco illo dicendi et horrido modo*). But in this context, after the unedifying stichomythia, they are hardly out of place. Menelaus' standard use of the form is met by a skilful variation on it by Teucer, who 'instead of seeking for an illustration, puts the case

as it stands, – thus more openly expressing his scorn’ (Campbell on 1150; cf. M. Heath (1987) 200). For another creative use of the fable for self-description Fraenkel (1983) 449 ~ (2007a) 59 cites Plaut. *Stich.* 539–66, where Antipho expresses his scandalous desire for up to four female bedfellows, together with the means to maintain them, by means of a fable beginning *fuit olim, quasi ego sum, senex*. Winnington-Ingram (1980) 64 n. 21 unfairly calls Teucer’s handling of the form ‘characteristically incompetent’; what is characteristic, however, is Teucer’s continued vituperation and almost complete lack of engagement with the ethical principles which could support his stance. For the capping of one fable by another cf. Ar. *Lys.* 781–96, 805–20, *Ach.* 1128–31; also Theogn. 915–26. See further Fraenkel (1920) = (1964) I 235–9, Van Dijk (1997) 176–81.

After the fables come a final pair of couplets announcing Menelaus’ departure. They maintain the personal antagonism to the end, with Teucer’s syntax and sense partly mirroring Menelaus’ utterance.

1142–3 ἤδη ποτ’ εἶδον ἄνδρ’ ἐγὼ γλώσση θρασὺν | ναῦτας ἐφορμήσαντα
χειμῶνος τὸ πλεῖν ‘Once I saw a man, bold of speech, who was urging sailors
on to sail in a storm.’ ἤδη ποτε refers to ‘unspecified past time’ (Diggle on
Theophr. *Char.* 1.5, p. 177; cf. Gow on Theocr. 5.143). For ποτε beginning a
fable cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1410, 1435, 1446, Philemon fr. 127.1 *PCG*, Ter. *Andr.* 221, 923
(*olim*), Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1040; for ποτε opening a narrative more generally
cf. *El.* 566, Braswell on Pind. *N.* 9.18. For εἶδον at the start of a fable Fraenkel
(1960) 421 ~ (2007b) 437 compares Plaut. *Rud.* 955 *furtum ego vidi qui faciebat*,
1124 *vidi petere miluom*; cf. also Eur. *El.* 369 ἤδη γὰρ εἶδον ἄνδρα, Theogn.
915, 920, [Cleobulina] fr. 1.1 and 2.1 *IEG* ἄνδρ’ εἶδον, which also contain ‘the
unqualified ἀνὴρ, with which a character of the story is introduced, [which]
is a typical feature of the terse style of the old αἶνος’ (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.*
719). West (1997) 521 cites pieces of Hebrew wisdom literature which begin ‘I
have seen’ followed by a description of a fool or malefactor; further parallels
in *id.* (2007) 366–7 with n. 76. The genitive of time (21–2n.) is also common in
fables, often with reference to a storm, as the scene is quickly set for the action
which carries the message (Karadagli (1981) 111–13). For the article with the
infinitive see 727–8n.

1144–6 ᾧ φθέγγυμ’ ἂν οὐκ ἐνηῦρες, ἥνικ’ ἐν κακῷ | χειμῶνος εἶχετ’, ἀλλ’ ὕφ’
εἵματος κρυφείς | πατεῖν παρείχε τῷ θέλοντι ναυτίλων. ‘in whom you could
not have found a voice, when he was caught in the midst of the storm’s peril;
but, hidden under a cloak, he let any of the sailors trample on him at will.’ For
the picture cf. Pl. *Theat.* 191a ἐὰν δὲ πάντῃ ἀπώρῃσωμεν, ταπεινωθέντες οἶμαι
τῷ λόγῳ παρέξομεν ὥς ναυτιῶντες πατεῖν τε καὶ χρῆσθαι ὅτι ἂν βούληται,
Dio Chrys. 3.63 ὅταν . . . καταλάβῃ χειμῶν, ἐγκαλυψάμενοι περιμένουσι τὸ
συμβησόμενον, Byron (1809) 229 = 973–4 ‘I . . . wrapped myself up in my
Albanian capote (an immense cloak) & lay down on deck to wait the worst’

(during a storm), Meyer (1971) 68 ‘if there’s a storm they lie flat in the boat and pray to the Virgin Mary instead of reefing the sails’ (Ibsen on Neapolitan fishermen; I owe the last two references to MD). For voicelessness as a response to fear cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.774, Appian *BC* 1.443 οὐδὲ φωνὴν ἔτι τῶν θεωμένων οὐδενὸς ἐπὶ τοσοῖσδε κακοῖς ἔχοντος ὑπ’ ἐκπλήξεως.

For the orthography of φθέγγμ’ see 14n. ἐνηῦρες (Dindorf³; ἐνεῦρες *iam* Hartung) fits with the bare dative as manuscript ἄν ηῦρες does not. ἐνευρίσκω is not attested elsewhere until the Imperial period, but we should probably restore it (with Dobree) at Ar. *Ach.* 1037–8 ἀνήρ ἀνηύρηκεν τι ταῖς σπονδαῖσιν ἡδύ. Double ἄν separated by a bare negative is unremarkable (see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 771); it would not ‘[add] liveliness to φθέγμα’ (*pace* Campbell) or possess ‘sarcastic force’ (*pace* Jebb).

For ἐν κακῷ | χειμῶνος εἶχετ’ Jebb compares Hdt. 9.37.2 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κακῷ ἐχόμενος and OC 1358–9 ἐν κλόνῳ | . . . βεβηκῶς τυγχάνεις κακῶν. In the first two passages ἐν refers to the circumstance, but comes close to designating the agent.

For ὑφ’ εἵματος κρυφαίς cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 81 δακρύω . . . ὑφ’ εἵμάτων. Most manuscripts have κρυφαίς (the regular Attic form, here unmetrical) or κρυβαίς. The latter is found at Eur. *Suppl.* 543 κρυβήσονται, which Elmsley emends to κρυφήσονται. As derivatives such as κρύφιος show, κρυφ– is the earlier form, with κρυβ– not established until well after S.’s time (thus W. S. Allen *ap.* Dawe, *STS* 1 167; cf. Collard on Eur. *Suppl.* 542–6).

Failure to understand the partitive genitive ναυτίλων led in some manuscripts to corruption into the case of the preceding participle (cf. [314]n.).

1147–9 οὕτω δὲ καὶ σὲ καὶ τὸ σὸν λάβρον στόμα | μικροῦ νέφους τάχ’ ἄν τις ἐκπνεύσας μέγας | χειμῶν κατασβέσειε τὴν πολλὴν βοήν. ‘So too with you and your boisterous speech, a great storm, arising from a small cloud, shall perhaps quench that loud shouting of yours.’ ‘At the end the narrator points the tale by adding something like “Thus you too . . .” or “Likewise I . . .”’ (Perry (1940) 394; cf. West on Hes. *Op.* 213). For οὕτω and similar words used for this purpose, usually accompanied by a word for ‘you’, cf. Theogn. 923, Ar. *Vesp.* 1432 οὕτω δὲ καὶ σύ, Arist. *Rhet.* 1393b.18–19 (= Stes. TA8 *PMGF*) οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, Call. *A.P.* 7.89.16 = 1292 *HE* οὕτω καὶ σύ, Δίων, τὴν κατὰ σαντὸν ἔλα, Lucilius 561 Marx *sic tu illos fructus quaeras*, Phaedrus 1.2.30–1 ‘vos quoque, o cives’, ait, ‘hoc sustinete’, Perry (1940) 396, Karadaglı (1981) 113–14, Davies (2001) 200 with n. 29. Similar phraseology occurs in comparisons which are not strictly fables: cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 68 τὼς καὶ ἐγώ, *Sept.* 609 οὕτως, Eur. *Tro.* 694 οὕτω δὲ κάγω, Hom. *Od.* 21.305 ὥς καὶ σοί, Bacchyl. 5.31 τὼς νῦν καὶ ἐμοί, Xen. *Mem.* 2.7.14 καὶ σὺ οὖν, Pl. *Phaedo* 60c ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ αὐτῷ μοι ἔοικεν.

The combination exemplified by καὶ σὲ καὶ τὸ σὸν λάβρον στόμα, where the person and something relating to the person are joined by καὶ (often καὶ . . . καὶ), here has an antagonistic or contemptuous edge: cf. *Ant.* 95–6 ἀλλ’ ἔα με καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἐμοῦ δυσβουλίαν | παθεῖν τὸ δεινὸν τοῦτο, 573 ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς καὶ σὺ καὶ τὸ σὸν λέχος, *El.* 522 καὶ σὲ καὶ τὰ σά, *OR* 426–7 πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ Κρέοντα καὶ τούμὸν στόμα | προπηλάκιζε (where στόμα refers to a different person, although the form is essentially the same), Agathon *TrGF* 39 F 13.1 ἀπολείς μ’ ἐρωτῶν καὶ σὺ χῶ νέος τρόπος, *Ar. Av.* 893 ἀπελθ’ ἄφ’ ἡμῶν καὶ σὺ καὶ τὰ στέμματα, [Dem.] 26.4 οὐδεὶς ἀντιλέγειν ἐπιχειρήσει . . . πλὴν Ἀριστογείτονος τουτοῦ καὶ τῆς τούτου πονηρίας, and the English idiom ‘you and your big mouth’. (It is also found in neutral contexts, as at *Phil.* 1378 σε τήνδε τ’ ἐμπυον βάσις, *OR* 905, *OC* 750, *Eur. Or.* 545 ὅπου σε μέλλω σὴν τε λυπήσειν φρένα [*del.* Paley], *Aesch. Ag.* 1305, *Hom. Il.* 9.679; see further Lobeck’s n. and Fehling (1969) 218.)

λάβρος can be applied to both turbulent weather and boisterous speech; here both ideas are intertwined. καὶ σὲ καὶ τὸ σὸν λάβρον στόμα is picked up by a fresh accusative τὴν πολλὴν βοήν (cf. 1062–3n.). For the ‘cloud which heralds the lightning’ cf. fr. 539 *TrGF* πέμφιγι πᾶσιν ὄψιν ἀγγελῶ πυρός with Pearson. For the corruption which causes the minority variant μέγα see Dawe, *STS* 178. For metaphorical (κατα)σβέννυμι see 1057–60n., adding Anon. *A.P.* 9.451.4 ἔσβεσεν ἑλλάδα φωνήν.

1150–1 ἐγὼ δὲ γ’ ἄνδρ’ ὅπωπα μωρίας πλέων, | ὅς ἐν κακοῖς ὕβριζε τοῖσι τῶν πέλας. ‘And I saw a man full of foolishness, who behaved with contempt amid his neighbours’ troubles.’ For δὲ γε ‘in retorts and lively rejoinders’ in tragedy, comedy, and prose see Denniston 153. For μωρίας πλέων see 745–6n. ‘Foolishness’ is akin to wickedness: cf. fr. 925 *TrGF* ἡ δὲ μωρία | μάλιστ’ ἀδελφὴ τῆς πονηρίας ἔφυ. This sense of ἐν κακοῖς gives a statement similar to *Aesch. Ag.* 1612 Αἴγισθ’, ὕβριζεν ἐν κακοῖσιν οὐ σέβω (‘Aegisthus, I have no respect for arrogance amid others’ disaster’: Collard); see further 532n.

1152–5 κᾶτ’ αὐτὸν εἰσιδὼν τις ἐμφορῆς ἐμοὶ | ὀργὴν θ’ ὁμοῖος εἶπε τοιοῦτον λόγον· | “ὦνθρωπε, μὴ δρᾷ τοὺς τεθηκότες κακῶς· | εἰ γὰρ ποιήσεις, ἴσθι πημανούμενος.” ‘And then someone like me in appearance and character saw him and spoke the following words. “You there, don’t insult the dead. Because if you do, be sure that you’ll pay for it.”’ κᾶτα is a typical feature of the αἶνος, in which a description of a situation is often followed by a statement beginning ‘(and) then’, which introduces a crucial speech or action. Cf. *Ar. Vesp.* 1384, 1403, 1411, 1430–1 κᾶπειτ’ ἐπιστὰς εἶπ’ ἀνὴρ αὐτῷ φίλος· | “ἔρδοι τις ἦν ἕκαστος εἰδείη τέχνην”, 1438, *Philemon* fr. 127.2 *PCG*, *Plaut. Stich.* 545 (*deinde*), *Ter. Andr.* 223, 924 (*tum*), *Fraenkel* (1920) 367–8 = (1964) 1 236–7. In general, this technique is used ‘to give the flavour of popular or unsophisticated story-telling and narrative’ (Davies (1989b) 26 n. 63); cf. *El.* 419n. We must

therefore reject Jebb's view that εἴτα 'introduc[es] the consequence of such ὕβρις' (for the sense 'and as a result' see Finglass (2009d) 51 n. 21).

ἐμφερής and ὁμοίος stress similarity (in fact, identity); cf. perhaps Aesch. *Cho.* 205–6 καὶ μὴν στίβοι γε, δεύτερον τεκμήριον, | ποδῶν, ὁμοιοι, τοῖς τ' ἐμοῖσιν ἐμπερεῖς. For the accentuation of ὁμοίος see 550–in. XrXs gloss ὀργήν with ὀρμήν, a common confusion (*El.* 101in.).

The 'explicitly gnomic, but at the same time dramatic' practice 'of putting a genuine moral at the end of a fable in the mouth of the last speaker' (Perry (1940) 400) is attested as early as Hes. *Op.* 210–11; cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1430–1 (cited above), Phaedrus 1.26.10–11, 4.18.8–10, 4.20.6, Babrius 6.15–17, 112.8–10, App. 161 (p. 451 Perry). For the form of Teucer's 'moral' (an 'admonitory reference to possible future bad consequences for the addressee') Davies (2001) 200–1 cites passages from Babrius (e.g. 47.13–14 “ἦν δ' ἄλλος ἄλλον χωρὶς ἦτε τὴν γνώμην, | πείσεσθ' ἕκαστος ταῦτ' αὖτ' ἡ μὴ ῥάβδω”); Fraenkel (1920) 369 = (1964) I 238 compares the distinct but related usage whereby the moral is pointed in a past counterfactual ('if you had done this, it would have been better'), pointing to Ar. *Vesp.* 1403–5, 1438–40, Phaedrus 1.3.13. The imperative also commonly ends a fable (examples at Davies (2001) 201–2); the form it takes here, as Kamerbeek notes, is reminiscent of moral recommendations such as γαμῖν ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων· ἐὰν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν κρειπτόνων, δεσπότης, οὐ συγγενεῖς κτήσῃ and μὴ κακολόγει τοὺς πλησίον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀκούσῃ ἐφ' οἷς λυπηθήσῃ (*Sept. Sap.* D–K 10 α.18, γ.4 = I 63.9–10, 26–7). But the tone is more threatening than these calls to abstract virtue: cf. Hom. *Od.* 21.305–6 ὥς καὶ σοὶ μέγα πῆμα πιφάσσκομαι, αἶ κε τὸ τόξον | ἐντανύσῃς.

ὦνθρωπε addressing someone unknown to the speaker is neutral in tone (79in.); because of the assimilation of the characters in the fable to Teucer and Menelaus, in effect it designates a known person and is thus rougher, as at Pl. *Gorg.* 518c ἴσως ἂν οὖν ἡγανάκτεις, εἴ σοι ἔλεγον ἐγὼ ὅτι “ἄνθρωπε, ἐπαίεις οὐδὲν περὶ γυμναστικῆς [κτλ.]”. This too fits the fable form: 'the disparaging tone . . . is equivalent to the ὦ σῦτος, which one often finds set in the mouth of the speaker of a fable's climactic rebuke' (Davies (2002) 39 n. 12, comparing Fab. Graec. 110 Perry; cf. Karadagli (1981) 116–18). For colloquial language in *oratio recta* see Collard (2005a) 355–6.

For the ellipse of τοῦτο in εἰ γὰρ ποιήσεις cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 935 ὃ δ' οὖν ποιείτω and possibly Hes. *Op.* 708 (but see West). I write ποι– and not πο– (pace *El.* 277n.; cf. 1356, 1369) because this is commoner at all periods before epsilon/eta on Attic inscriptions (Threatte I 326–9; further bibliography in W. Arnott (2001) 44 with n. 5); it also happens to be better attested in each case. πημανούμενος is a future middle with passive sense; this archaic usage appears several times in all three tragedians and in prose (examples at K–G I 114–16, Bruhn §100, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 516).

1156 τοιαῦτ' ἀνολβον ἄνδρ' ἐνουθέτει παρών. 'Such is the advice which he gave the wretch to his face.' For ἀνολβος of foolishness cf. *Ant.* 1025–6 κείνος οὐκέτ' ἔστ' ἀνὴρ | ἄβουλος οὐδ' ἀνολβος, 1265 ὧμοι ἐμῶν ἀνολβα βουλευμάτων; also *OR* 887–8 κακά νιν ἔλοιτο μοῖρα, | δυσπότημου χάριν χλιδᾶς, *Dem.* 3.21 οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἄφρων οὐδὲ ἀτυχής εἰμι ἐγώ. For παρών see 337–8n.

1157–8 ὁρῶ δέ τοί νιν, κάστιν, ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, | οὐδεὶς ποτ' ἄλλος ἢ σύ. μῶν ἥνιξάμην; 'I see him, I tell you, and he is, as it seems to me, no one other than you. Have I spoken in riddles?' For the application of the fable to the addressee cf. *Plaut. Rud.* 962 *namque hoc omne attinet ad te*, *Phaedrus App.* 10.12–14 *et tu nisi istum tecum assidue detines | feroxque ingenium comprimis clementia, | vide ne querela maior accrescat domus*. For μῶν see 791n.; for ἥνιξάμην, *Theogn.* 681 (= Euenus fr. 8b *IEG*) ταῦτά μοι ἥνιχθω κεκρυμμένα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν. Cf. *Ant.* 405 ἄρ' ἔνδηλα καὶ σαφῇ λέγω; and *Aesch. Ag.* 269 ἡ τορῶς λέγω;, both of which are impatient questions accompanying the repetition of information imparted clearly only a moment before.

1159–60 ἄπειμι· καὶ γὰρ αἰσχρόν, εἰ πύθοιτό τις | λόγοις κολάζειν ᾧ βιάζεσθαι πάρα. 'I will go: it would be shameful if anyone learned that I was chastising with words when I could use force' (Lloyd-Jones). Menelaus' preference for violence over words picks up 1067–70. πάρα becomes παρῇ in some manuscripts, either under the influence of 1081, or because after εἰ πύθοιτό τις 'some early scholar . . . felt an incongruity in the fusion of general and particular' (Campbell); Menelaus cannot use an indefinite subjunctive when referring to himself.

Menelaus leaves via eisodos A, with attendants.

1161–2 ἄφερπέ νυν. κάμοι γὰρ αἰσχιστον κλύειν | ἄνδρὸς ματαίου φλαῦρ' ἔπη μυθουμένου. 'Then go: since for me too it's most shameful to hear a foolish man speaking words of abuse.' For 'lines cast after a departing back' see Taplin (1971) 42 n. 39 and (1977) 221–2, citing e.g. *Phil.* 1259–60; 'the device tends to lack dignity, and is often used to lower the tragic or heroic tone' (p. 222). ἄφερπέ νυν picking up ἄπειμι is paralleled by e.g. *S. El.* [1050–2] ἄπειμι τοῖνον . . . ἀλλ' εἴσιθ'; *Eur. Alc.* 729–30 ἄπελθε . . . ἄπειμι, but Teucer reinforces the effect by imitating Menelaus' syntax and language, and intensifying the latter (αἰσχιστον ~ αἰσχρόν). The stifling antagonism is maintained to the end. Inferential νυν for manuscript νῦν is owed to Stephanus (1568) 18. For φλαῦρος of abusive speech cf. 1323, Olson on *Ar. Pax* 96–7.

1163–7 Transitional choral anapaests unattached to lyric are rare in tragedy. Elsewhere (*Aesch. Suppl.* 966–79, *Ag.* 1331–42, *Cho.* 719–29, 855–68, *Eur. Med.* 759–63) they involve the arrival or departure of at least one character; this also holds for *Ant.* 929–43, where anapaests delivered by both chorus and actors

follow an actor's speech and lead into the choral ode. The change of metre supports the change of mood, as the petty insults of the *agon* yield to the moving supplicatory tableau beside Ajax's body.

1163 ἔσται μεγάλης ἐριδός τις ἄγων. 'There will be a contest of great strife.' The 'contest' is the coming struggle over the burial. The genitive of definition ἐριδός... ἄγων is paralleled by μάχης ἄγων at *Ti.* 20, Eur. *Held.* 798, *Andr.* 725, Pl. *Resp.* 547d τῆς τοῦ πολέμου ἀγωνίας, Mimmermus fr. 14.7 *IEG* αἵματόεν<τος ἐν> ὑσμίνη πολέμοιο, Dem. 25.4 ὁ ἄγων... τοῦ πολέμου. For intensifying τις see 28n.; an indefinite sense would make the danger seem inappropriately distant.

1164–6 ἀλλ' ὥς δύνασαι, Τεῦκρε, ταχύνας | σπεῦσον κοίλην κάπετον· τιν' ἰδεῖν | τῷδ' 'Come now, to the best of your ability, Teucer, make haste and hurry to see to a hollow trench for this man.' For ἀλλά see n. on 194a. κοίλην κάπετον is an epic phrase (Hom. *Il.* 24.797 ἐς κοίλην κάπετον θέσαν), taken up by Eur. *Alc.* 898 τάφρον ἐς κοίλην. Since it occurs in the description of Hector's burial, Stanford sees an echo of that passage; but would the audience recognise it as coming from a specific Homeric locus rather than as a piece of general epic colour? κάπετος (cf. 1403), normally 'trench', may contain 'a suggestion of graves dug in haste' (Gow and Page on Posid. 3135 *HE* = fr. 121.2 A–B).

For ἰδεῖν cf. *Phil.* 843 ἀλλά, τέκνον, τάδε μὲν θεὸς ὄψεται, Hom. *Od.* 8.443 αὐτὸς νῦν ἰδεῖ πῶμα, Theocr. 15.2 ὄρη δρίφον, Εὐνόα, αὐτῆ, Ter. *Heaut.* 459 *aliud lenius sodes vide*, Cic. *Tusc.* 3.46 *dulciculae potionis aliquid videamus et cibi* (cf. *OLD* s.v. *uideō* 18b); also perhaps Theocr. *A.P.* 6.339.4 = 3391 *HE* καὶ τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ προσήκον ὁρῶν with Gow and Page. Conjectures such as τεύχειν (F. Schmidt (1886–7) 1117) and σκάπτειν (LJ–J/W) are palaeographically difficult, and unhelpfully suggest that Teucer is to dig the grave himself (thus Renehan (1992) 352). Renehan himself takes κοίλην κάπετον as the direct object of σπεῦσον, with ἰδεῖν as an epexegetic infinitive marking that Ajax's tomb will be a great sight, something 'to behold'. But even if we allow the construction of σπεῦσον, epexegetic ἰδεῖν could not support the interpretative weight which Renehan places upon it; nor would prospective magnificence suit the emphasis on haste.

1166–7 ἐνθα βροτοῖς τὸν ἀείμνηστον | τάφον εὐρώεντα καθέξει. 'where he may possess a dank tomb that will always be remembered among mortals.' εὐρώεις appears in descriptions of the Underworld: cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.64–5 οἰκία... | σμερδαλέ' εὐρώεντα (of Hades), *Od.* 10.512 Ἄϊδεω... δόμον εὐρώεντα, Henrichs (1993) 171 n. 20, West (1997) 161–2, Magnani (2007) 163 n. 23, 164. Hermann^{1–2} (*prob.* Kahlenberg (1903) 33–5) derives the adjective from εὐρύς 'wide' (cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.245–7 τύμβον δ' οὐ μάλα πολλὸν ἐγὼ πονέεσθαι

ἄνωγα, | ἀλλ' ἐπιεικέα τοῖον· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀχαιοί | εὐρύν θ' ὕψηλόν τε
τιθήμεναι), a sense found only in Imperial Greek poetry and lexicographers
(Hesych. ε 7159 = π 235 Latte εὐρώνετα· πλατέα).

For (κατ)έχω predicated of the dead, with the tomb, earth, or other resting-
place as the object, cf. *OC* 1763 θήκην ἱεράν, ἣν κείνος ἔχει, Aesch. *Ag.* 452–5
οἱ δ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τείχος | θήκας Ἰλιάδος γᾶς | εὐμορφοὶ κατέχουσιν, ἐχθρὰ δ'
ἔχοντας ἔκρυψεν, 1539–40, *Sept.* 731–3, *Suppl.* 24–5 βαρύτιμοι | χθόνιοι θήκας
κατέχοντες, Argentarius *A.P.* 11.28.1 = 1463 *GP* πέντε θανῶν κείση κατέχων
πόδας. Henrichs (1993) 174 argues that having Ajax as the subject rather than
the object 'puts the hero squarely in charge of his tomb', but as the parallels
demonstrate, this locution applies to the powerful and powerless dead. In other
passages the earth κατέχει the dead (cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.629, Archil. fr. 196a.12
IEG, Bond on Eur. *Her.* 1016, Henrichs (1993) 171 n. 21, 173 with n. 29).

ἄειμνηστον of the grave recalls the use of μνήμα and then μνημεῖον to
denote a tomb, first attested in sixth-century inscriptions (see Henrichs (1993)
172 nn. 23–4, Lattimore (1942) 244–5); cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.618–19, where Achilles
calls the prize which he gives to Nestor a Πατρόκλοιο τάφου μνήμα(α). For the
final-consecutive use of the future see 470–2n.

1168–84 'In these lines we can trace an unparalleled and extremely affecting
interweaving of three separate ritual acts – supplication, an offering to the
dead and a solemn curse' (Burian (1972) 152).

1168–70 Tecmessa and Eurysaces enter from eisodos B, with attendants,
carrying offerings for Ajax's burial. The appearance of the pair indicates
the fulfilment of Tecmessa's mission (985–9). A silent entry is unusual for a
character as important as Tecmessa; Taplin (1977) 284 compares Eur. *Alc.* 1006
and *IT* 1222.

καὶ μὴν ἐς αὐτὸν καιρὸν οἶδε πλησίοι | πάρεσιν ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε παῖς τε καὶ
γυνή, | τάφον περιστελοῦντε δυστήνου νεκροῦ. 'Just in time, here come this
man's son and wife, to adorn the grave of the wretched corpse.' καὶ μὴν marks
the entrance (cf. 1223, Denniston 356). For ἐς αὐτὸν καιρὸν cf. Eur. *Or.* 384
σῶσόν μ' – ἀφίξαι δ' αὐτὸν [*coni.*: αὐτός codd.] ἐς καιρὸν – κακῶν; normally ἐς
καιρὸν appears unqualified (examples at J. Jackson (1955) 190). For the sense of
καιρός see Race (1981) 213 with n. 45. Both πλησίοι and the minority variant
–ιον would make sense (cf. *El.* 640 παρούσης τῆσδε πλησίας ἐμοί, 927 τοῦ
πλησίον παρόντος), and preceding αὐτὸν καιρὸν and οἶδε could have caused
corruption in either direction. We may as well print the better attested word.

1171–2 ὦ παῖ, πρόσελθε δεῦρο, καὶ σταθεὶς πέλας | ἰκέτης ἔφασαι πατρός,
ὅς σ' ἐγείνατο. 'Child, come here, take your place nearby, and, as a suppliant,
grasp hold of the father who bore you.' For the significance of the act of
supplication see Introduction §5(c). The concluding phrase emphasises the

bond between father and son at the moment that they come into contact (cf. *El.* 261n.). ἐστόθην sometimes replaces ἔσθην in poetry (K–B II 197). ἰκτης would remove the line-initial anapaest, but the form is unattested until *Lyc. Alex.* 763 and Hesych. 1511 = II 358 Latte. ἰκτήριον in 1175, corrupted in a few manuscripts to ἰκετ–, is attested in all three tragedians, but nowhere else in classical Greek, and scarcely elsewhere.

1173–5 θάκει δὲ προστρόπαιος ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων | κόμας ἐμὰς καὶ τῆσδε καὶ σαντοῦ τρίτου, | ἰκτήριον θησαυρόν. ‘Sit in supplication, taking in your hands my hair and hers and, third, your own, a supplicatory treasure.’ Sitting on the floor, especially at a hearth (Gould (1973) 78–9, 97–8 = (2001) 30, 63–4) or altar (Griffin (2007) 194–6), is a characteristic suppliant posture: cf. *OR* 1–3, 20, *Eur. Hcll.* 238–9, *Suppl.* 93, *Aesch. Ag.* 1587 προστρόπαιος ἐστίας, *Eum.* 41 ἔδραν ἔχοντα προστρόπαιον, *Hom. Od.* 7.153–4 κατ’ ἄρ’ ἔξετ’ ἐπ’ ἐσχάρῃ ἐν κονίῃσι | παρ πυρί, *Hdt.* 6.108.4, *Thuc.* 1.136.3 (Themistocles) τὸν παῖδα... λαβὼν καθέζεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἐστίαν, 3.28.2, 3.70.5, *Tibullus* 2.6.33 *illius ad tumulum fugiam supplexque sedebo*, *Suda* ε 2255 (II 351.9–11 Adler; on how a Scythian wanting to make a supplication sacrifices an ox, and then ἐκπετάσας χαμαὶ τὴν βύρσαν ἐκάθητο ἐπ’ αὐτῆς εἰς τοῦπίσω παραγαγὼν τῷ χεῖρε. καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι Σκύθαις ἡ μέγιστη ἰκετήρια), *Burian* (1972) 152 n. 5, *Telò* (2002a) 35–6 n. 58. For offerings of hair to the dead see *El.* 52n.

For a-vocalism in θακέω see 105–6n. προστρόπαιος ‘suppliant’ (cf. 831) here lacks its frequent additional nuance ‘in need of purification’; see Fraenkel on *Aesch. Ag.* 1587, FJ/W on *Aesch. Suppl.* 362, R. Parker (1983) 108 with n. 13. For τρίτος denoting completion of a series cf. *OC* 7–8 στέργειν γὰρ αἱ πάθαι με χῶ χρόνος ξυνών | μακρὸς διδάσκει καὶ τὸ γενναῖον τρίτον, *Alcaeus fr.* 129.7–9 Voigt, *Risch* (1962) 137–8 = (1981) 685–6, FJ/W on *Aesch. Suppl.* 708. For ἰκτ– see previous n.

1175–9 εἰ δέ τις στρατοῦ | βίᾳ σ’ ἀποσπάσειε τοῦδε τοῦ νεκροῦ, | κακὸς κακῶς ἀθαπτος ἐκπέσοι χθονός, | γένους ἄπαντος ῥίζαν ἐξημημένους, | αὐτως ὅπως περ τόνδ’ ἐγὼ τέμνω πλόκον. ‘But if anyone from the army should drag you from this corpse by force, may the wretch be wretchedly cast unburied out of the land, and the root of his entire family mown down, in exactly the same way as I cut this lock.’ Teucer’s solemn imprecation contains various features typical of a curse: polyptoton (κακὸς κακῶς: [839–42]n.), destruction of the malefactor’s γένος (Solon fr. 33.7 *IEG*, [Archil.] fr. 327.8–9, *IG* IX/1²/1 170.13–14 (310–280 BC) ἐξώλης εἶην [αὐτὸς καὶ] γένος, *IGSK* XVIII/1 500.13–14 ὥλης ἐξώλης ἀπόλοιτο κὲ γένος τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, *Lindos II* 419.123–5 (AD 22) αὐτὸς τε ἐξώλης ἔστω καὶ ἐπάρατος καὶ γένος αὐτοῦ, *West* (1999b) 35–6, A/O on *Ar. Thesm.* 349–51; also *Hes. Op.* 282–5), ‘root and branch’ annihilation (cf. πρόρριζος (*El.* 512n.) at *Eur. Hipp.* 684, *Ar. Ran.* 587–8, on which see Fraenkel

on Aesch. *Ag.* 535–6), and homoeopathy ([839–42]n.). Verbal vigour masks the family’s vulnerability.

For ἐκρίπτω in this context see 1064–5n. ῥίζα of a family is a common poetic metaphor: see Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.15(a), LSJ⁹ s.v. π 1. For αὐτως ὁπωσπερ cf. αὐτως ὡς at *Ti.* 1036/7–1038/40 τὰν ᾧδ’ ἐπίδοιμι πεσοῦσαν | αὐτως, ᾧδ’ αὐτως, ὡς μ’ ὠλεσεν, Hom. *Il.* 22.125, Hes. *Th.* 702, Ap. Rh. 1.890; also [839–42]n. on ὥσπερ . . . τῶς. For the smooth breathing in αὐτως see Jebb on *OR* 931.

1180–1 ἔχ’ αὐτόν, ᾧ παῖ, καὶ φύλασσε, μηδέ σε | κινήσάτω τις, ἀλλὰ προσπεσὼν ἔχου. ‘Take hold of it, child, and guard it. Don’t let anyone move you, but prostrate yourself and grip hold of him.’ The repeated, increasingly powerful, imperatives emphasise the urgency. The first two commands refer to the hair (with αὐτόν referring to πλόκον in 1179), but μηδέ σε | κινήσάτω τις implies the body, and hence so must ἔχου (‘cling to’, as in Aesch. *Sept.* 99 ἀκμάζει βρετέων ἔχασθαι, rather than ἔχε ‘hold fast?’).

Henrichs (1993) 167 compares Aesch. *Eum.* 243 and 440, where φυλάσσω is predicated of the suppliant Orestes gripping the cult image of Athena, and Eur. *Her.* 51, where it is used of Amphitryon and the family of Heracles in an act of supplication (τάσδ’ ἔδρας φυλάσσομεν). But while in those passages the verb may denote ‘the suppliant’s physical attachment to the locus of supplication where he abides, as well as his ritual attention to the supernatural power that protects him’, here it takes πλόκον as its object (as H. acknowledges), and so does not take that nuance. For supplicatory προσπίτνω, προσπίπτω cf. *El.* 453 αἰτοῦ . . . προσπίτνουσα (also of the dead), LSJ⁹ s.v. π, Telò (2002b) 33 with n. 79.

1182–4 ὑμεῖς τε μὴ γυναῖκες ἀντ’ ἀνδρῶν πέλας | παρέστατ’, ἀλλ’ ἀρήγετ’, ἔστ’ ἐγὼ μόλω | τάφου μεληθεὶς τῷδε, κἄν μηδεὶς ἔῃ. ‘And you, do not stand by him as women instead of men, but lend your aid, until I return after taking care of a grave for this man, even if no one allows it.’ For the exhortation ‘be men, not women’ cf. Hom. *Il.* 7.96 Ἀχαῖδες, οὐκέτ’ Ἀχαιοί. Blaydes¹ changes τε το δέ, but see 687–9n. For παρίσταμαι in contexts of assistance see 92n. For the passive μεληθεὶς in a middle sense see 24n. Instead of μόλω . . . μεληθεὶς *EM* 382.5 reads μολών . . . μεληθῶ (L^{ac}O offer μολών . . . μεληθεὶς), removing the crucial reference to Teucer’s return.

Teucer leaves via eisodos A, movement which ‘contributes to the presentation of Teucer as active and in control of the situation’ (M. Heath (1987) 201). His words at 1223–5 indicate that he has seen Agamemnon on his way and so must have departed towards the camp, the direction from which any potential trouble would probably arise. H/OK (2007) 375 suggest that because the *Iliad* places Ajax’s troops adjacent to the Athenians (2.[558]), ‘Teucer’s exit in this direction . . . might therefore predispose the audience to expect

Athenian involvement in the continuing action'. But the play never refers to the position of the Athenians, and Teucer makes no mention of possible Athenian support. With his departure the focus falls on the tableau around the corpse. Before, Tecmessa had lifted Eurysaces up to Ajax on the ekkyklema to receive paternal guidance (545); now the two of them crouch down at his body, to lend it their protection.

THIRD STASIMON (1185–1222)

1185–1222 The imperfective woe which takes up the first strophe recalls the opening of the first stasimon. But while there the chorus moved from this background to the horror of the present situation, here they move backwards in time, to the man who first invented war. Their curse is followed by its justification; the lengthy list of pleasures which he has denied them contrasts with the pains of their present state. Thus by the end of the second strophe the song has returned to its opening theme, the chorus's suffering at Troy. In the final stanza, they turn from this suffering to thoughts of Ajax, and a contrast between a happier past and unfortunate present (cf. the first antistrophe of the first stasimon, M. Heath (1987) 201). Before his death, Ajax could protect them from distress; now he is gone, no more pleasure is left for them. The rhetorical question in 1215/16 is left hanging; the chorus end by wishing for Sunium and Athens, balancing the earlier references to Troy (1190, 1209/10). The wide chronological and geographical sweep gives some relief after the intensity of the argument over Ajax's body; but the length and power of the curse, even though it is directed at a distant source of misery, prevents the ode from simply providing respite from the antagonism.

FIRST STROPHIC PAIR (1185–91 ~ 1192–8)

(1) 1185	1192	~~~~~—~—~—	
(2) 1185/6	1192/3	—~—~—~—~—~—	<i>ia 2cho ar</i>
(3) 1187/8	1194/5	—~—~—~—~—~—	<i>cho dim ia</i>
(4) 1188/9	1195/6	—~—~—~—~— ^H	<i>cho dim</i>
(5) 1190	1197	—~—~—~—~—	<i>gl</i>
(6) 1191	1198	—~—~—~—~—	<i>tel [^]ia_λ</i>

The ode begins with an asclepiadic colon: that is, aeolo-choriambic expanded in the middle by choriamb. The opening iambic metron (completely resolved as at *Ant.* 108 ~ 125, there also before a choriamb; one resolution in the same context at *El.* 823 ~ 837, Anacr. fr. 378.1 *PMG*) replaces the aeolic base (see the metrical introduction to 221/2–232 ~ 245/6–256, at (5–6)). S. begins the lyric at *El.* 823–70 in the same way. As there, an ionic analysis is also possible, with an opening colon ×—~— (for which see the *Electra* metrical analysis) and a concluding phrase ~—~— (for which cf. West (1982) 126). But the

dominance of aeolo- and iambo-choriambic in the rest of the stanza makes this the less attractive option.

In (5) the strophe is corrupt: see 1187/8–1191n. For the colon in (6) see the metrical analysis on (15) in the parodos.

SECOND STROPHIC PAIR (1199–1209/10 ~ 1211–1221/2)

(7) 1199	1211	⋈—⋈—⋈—⋈—	
(8) 1200	1212	—⋈—⋈—⋈—	
(9) 1201	1213	—⋈—⋈—⋈—	<i>ia 4cho ad</i>
(10) 1202/3	1214/15	—⋈—⋈—⋈—	
(11) 1203/4	1215/16	⋈—⋈—⋈—⋈—⋈—	— <i>4cho ad</i>
(12) 1205/6	1217/18	⋈—⋈—⋈—⋈—⋈—⋈—	<i>ia_h hi</i>
(13) 1207	1219	—⋈—⋈—⋈—	<i>hag</i>
(14) 1208	1220	⋈—⋈—⋈—	<i>tel</i>
(15) 1209	1221	—⋈—⋈—	<i>dodr</i>
(16) 1209/10	1221/2	⋈—⋈—⋈—	<i>pher</i>

Again, the stanza begins with an asclepiadic colon with iambic base, this time without resolution (for ×—⋈— —⋈— at the start of a stanza see L. Parker (1997) 81). Again, an ionic analysis is possible (with acatalectic ending, ⋈—⋈—: West (1982) 126), but less desirable owing to the metrical form of the remainder. Many words and phrases also fit into a choriamb. Dale (1936) 186 = (1969) 6 says of this colometry that ‘it looks temptingly neat, till we realize that precisely this symmetry is un-Sophoclean’, but the absence of neatness can hardly be a guiding principle. Her additional complaint about the adonean in (9) not falling at the end of a stanza is nullified by *El.* 824 ~ 838. She prefers a different emendation from the one adopted for the scheme above (see 1199–1201n.), which yields ×—⋈—⋈—⋈— etc. This must either be rendered as ionics (thus Dale in 1936; but this is undesirable, as just noted, and has an unusual iambic opening) or aeolo-choriambic (thus Dale (1968) 155 (without specifying her textual choice); but ×—⋈ is an incredible substitute for aeolic base).

Dale (1936) 186–7 = (1969) 6–7 sees a series of ionics *a maiore* (—⋈—⋈—), but this metron is probably a fiction (L. Parker (1997) 64). For the bacchiac preceding a hipponactean in (12) cf. the similar prefacing of glyconics described by Itsumi (1984) 80.

1185–1185/6 τίς ἄρα νέατος, ἐς πότῃ λήξει πολυπλάγκτων ἐτέων ἀριθμός ‘What will be the final count of the far-wandering years? When will they end...’ Although formally interrogative, this is not so much a genuine inquiry as an exclamation of distress at the length of the war (itself perhaps mimetically conveyed by the length of the sentence, as MD suggests); cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 681–9, also at the start of an ode. For two questions (enlivened by ἄρα: 905n.) with a shared predicate see K–G II 521–2. Temporal νέατος appears at

Ant. 808–808/9 νέατον δὲ φέγγος λεύσσουσιν ἀελίου, Eur. *Tro.* 201–2; for ἐξ accompanying adverbs of time, from Homer on, see Rutherford’s Phrynichus, p. 118 and Moorhouse 105. The mobility of the years implied by πολὺπλανκτος (cf. Hom. *Od.* 17.425, of pirates, and Aesch. *Suppl.* 571–3, of Io) contrasts with the resolutely fixed status of the chorus at Troy. For the corruption πολυπλάκτων see 596–8n.

1187/8–1192 τὰν ἄπαστον αἰὲν ἐμοὶ δορυσσοήτων μόχθων ἅταν ἐπάγων | †ἀνὰ τὰν εὐρώδῃ Τροίαν, † | δύστανον ὄνειδος Ἑλλάνων; ‘... always bringing upon me that ceaseless misery of the toils of battle, †throughout the wide land of Troy, † a wretched reproach to the Greeks?’ The definite article in τὰν ἄπαστον... ἅταν suggests the woeful familiarity of suffering; cf. *El.* 166–7 τὸν ἀνήνυτον | οἶτον ἔχουσα κακῶν, Eur. *Med.* 647–8 τὸν ἀμηχανίας ἔχουσα δυσπέρατον αἰῶ | οἰκτροτάτων ἀχέων (Hutchinson’s text, in his *Greek Lyric Poetry*). Since the final syllable of ἄπαστον is anceps, we can do without γ’ (Triclinius) or ἀπαύστων (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 8, giving an inoffensive distribution of adjectives (134–5n.), but a purposeless hyperbaton τὰν... ἅταν). West advocates the orthography ἄπαυτος for Aeschylus (in his Teubner, p. xlv, citing Herodian 1 224.14–16 Lentz). But whereas ἀκλαυτος is frequently attested in manuscripts of classical authors, we do not find ἄπαυτος, which suggests that the words follow different patterns; it would be odd for one to be corrupted regularly, and the other only occasionally.

Metrically guaranteed δορυσσοήτων (LK^{ac}), not attested elsewhere, is corrupted in most manuscripts to the *vox nihili* δορυσσόντων; the form found elsewhere is δορυσός (*OC* 1313 (perhaps interpolated), Aesch. *Sept.* 126, *Suppl.* 182, 985, Eur. *Held.* 774, Theogn. 988 δορυσσόν ἐξ πόνον ἀνδρῶν, [Hes.] *Scut.* 54). Tragedy is fond of extended adjectives in –ητος (see Davies on *Tr.* 61). Wackernagel (1925a) 54 = (1953–79) II 862 derives it from σείειν, Lobeck (1837) 562 from σοέω. For ἐπάγω of bringing on trouble cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 403–4 ἅτην | ἐτέραν ἐπάγουσαν ἐπ’ ἅτη, Hes. *Op.* 242 μέγ’ ἐπήγαγε πῆμα Κρονίων, LSJ⁹ s.v. 11.

1190 and the antistrophe (1197) scan ◡◡— — — — — and —◡—◡—◡—◡— respectively; these cannot respond, *pace* Magnani (2007). The former is an unfamiliar shape, while the latter is recognisable as a glyconic. The former also contains εὐρώδῃ, which must be corrupt; derivations from εὐρύς and εὐρώς are morphologically and semantically improbable respectively. One line of attack involves turning 1190 into a glyconic, by adopting ἄν for ἀνὰ (Ahrens (1851) 7 = (1891) 119; in K the second alpha is above the nu, which could conceivably be a trace of original ἄν) and εὐρυεδῇ for εὐρώδῃ (Musgrave), and by assuming the prosody ◡— for Τροίαν, or else the respension of a dragged to a non-dragged glyconic. Apocope of ἀνὰ is paralleled in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 566, *Suppl.* 351; conjecturally at *Suppl.* 550, 553) and Euripides (fr. 752f.29

TrGF; conjecturally at *El.* 466, *Her.* 389, *Phoen.* 1516). At *Tr.* 636 editors restore respension with Triclinius's πῶρ (for παρῶ), paralleled at *Aesch. Eum.* 229 (the only one of all these examples not in lyrics). This provides adequate support for ἄν in apocope in *S.* The alternative conjecture, τάνδ' ἄν' (Lobeck'), is more invasive. (Apocope of preverbs, on the other hand, is common in all three tragedians: 416/17–417/18n.) But neither the formation given by Musgrave's conjecture, nor the prosody of Τροίαν can be paralleled, while the postulated respension is extremely rare (three cases at most: Itsumi (1984) 75). Corruption is probably deep, and our only option is to obelise.

For the closing phrase (in apposition to the rest of the sentence: 558–9n.) cf. *Hor. C.* 4.12.6–7 *Cecropiae domus | aeternum opprobrium*. For δύστανος of things (not an Homeric usage) see *LSJ*⁹ s.v. δύστηνος I 2, *DGE* s.v. II 1, Braswell on *Pind. P.* 4.268(c).

1192–1195/6 ὄφελε πρότερον αἰθέρα δῦναι μέγαν ἢ τὸν πολυκοινὸν Ἄϊδαν | κείνος ἀνὴρ, ὃς στυγερῶν ἔδειξεν ὀπλῶν Ἑλλασιν κοινὸν Ἄρη. 'If only that man had first passed into the expanse of the sky, or to Hades, which all must share, who revealed to the Greeks the confederate warfare of hateful weapons!' The unexpected target of the curse is held back to create suspense. For similar attacks on the first person to perform a reprobate action, often involving a relative clause, cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 407–10 ὥς ὅλοιτο παγκάκως | ἦτις πρὸς ἄνδρας ἦρξάτ' αἰσχύνειν λέχη | πρώτη θυραίους. ἐκ δὲ γενναίων δόμων | τὸδ' ἦρξε θηλείαισι γίγνεσθαι κακόν, *Ar. Lys.* 946 κάκιστ' ἀπόλοιθ' ὁ πρῶτος ἐψησας μύρον, *Plaut. Men.* 451–2 *qui illum di omnes perduint qui primus <hoc> commentum est, | contionem habere, qui homines occupatos occupat*, *Prop.* 2.6.27–32, *Tibull.* 1.4.59–60, *Leo* (1912) 151–4. The inventor of weaponry is a πρῶτος εὑρετής (see *Kleingünther* (1933) on this idea in Greek thought), and the chorus's language contains two idioms familiar from descriptions of such individuals, who normally receive praise, not opprobrium: (i) δείκνυμι, for which cf. [*Aesch.*] *PV* 457–8 ἀντολὸς ἐγὼ | ἄστρων ἔδειξα τὰς τε δυσκρίτους δύσεις, *Arist. fr.* 673.4 *IEG* πρῶτος θνητῶν κατέδειξεν, *Antiphilus A.Pl.* 334.3–4 = 1071–2 *GP* (Diogenes) μῦθος . . . βιοτᾶς αὐτάρκεα δόξαν ἔδειξας | θνατοῖς, *Davies* (1986) 25–6 (also *Xenoph.* *D–K* 21 B 18.1 = 1 133.13 οὗτοι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πάντα θεοὶ θνητοῖς ὑπέδειξαν) and (ii) specification of the 'beneficiaries' of the invention, for which cf. *Machon* 464–6 Gow τοῦτ' εἶτε πρῶτοι Μακεδόνες τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς | κατέδειξαν [*Casaubon*: κατεδίδασαν *Athenaeus*] ἡμῖν εἶτε πάντες οἱ θεοὶ | οὐκ οἶδα and (more commonly) θνητοὶ or ἄνθρωποι, for which cf. two passages cited under (i), *Eur. Ba.* 279–80, and *Davies* (1986) 26. The idea of weaponry as an invention is found in other classical authors: in *Euripides* the bow is a πάνσοφον . . . εὔρημα (*Her.* 188), while *Hellanicus* refers to the invention of σιδηρ]ᾶ ὄπλα (*FGrHist* 4 F 189) and ὀπλουργία (*fr.* 71b *EGM*).

The chorus specifies alternative destinations for the malefactor, as at Eur. *Her.* 650–4 (referring to old age) κατὰ κυμάτων δ' | ἔρροι μηδέ ποτ' ὤφελεν | θνατῶν δώματα καὶ πόλεις | ἐλθεῖν, ἀλλὰ κατ' αἰθέρ' αἰεὶ πτεροῖσι φορεῖσθω (where see Bond, comparing a similar idiom in the prayer-form ἀποπομπή; 51–73n.). Multiplicity of place features in a different way in the curse at Timocreon fr. 731 *PMG* (see Page's apparatus): ὤφελέν σ' ὦ τυφλὲ Πλοῦτε μήτε γῇ μήτ' ἐν θαλάσσῃ | μήτ' ἐν ἡπείρῳ φανῆμεν, ἀλλὰ Τάρταρόν τε ναίειν | κάχέροντα· διὰ σέ γάρ πάντ' αἰὲν ἀνθρώποις κακά. Compare how 'several times in Eur<ipides> a character in an intolerable situation expresses a double-barrelled wish that he may either be swallowed up in the earth or fly up into the sky' (Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1290–3, with examples; cf. *id.* on 732–4 on wishes to fly, adding *Phoen.* 163–7).

P has ὄφελε (*coni.* Triclinius p. 23.21–24.6 Tessier, for the sake of respension); most manuscripts have ὤφελε. For the omission of the temporal augment with this verb cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 915, Eur. *Med.* 1413 (where again ο is corrupted to ω in most manuscripts), Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 939–41; for the phenomenon in general see 908/9–910n. The unaugmented form is also frequent in Homer (*Il.* 6.345 etc.). Pardini (1999) 106–7 argues for the majority reading on the ground of manuscript authority. A long syllable is possible since the position is anceps: but since the postulated corruption is so trivial, we should prefer the form yielding exact respension.

For Hades as πολύκοινος cf. *El.* 137–8 ἐξ Αἰδα | παγκοίνου λίμνας, Aesch. *Sept.* 860 πανδόκον, Pind. *N.* 7.30–1 κοινὸν . . . ἔρχεται | κῦμ' Αἰδα. The rough breathing in ἀνὴρ is owed to Bothe¹ (9–10n.). στυγεράων . . . δπλων is a defining genitive accompanying κοινὸν Ἄρη. For the correct form of the accusative Ἄρη see 253/4–256n. πολύκοινος implies 'shared by all', not just ' . . . by many': cf. Pind. *P.* 2.41 τὰν πολύκοινον ἀνδέξατ' ἀγγελίαν.

1197 ὦ πόνοι πρόγονοι πόνων· 'O toils progenitors of toils.' ὦ, presumably a conjecture by Triclinius for transmitted ἰώ (for the corruption see 372–3n.), is rewritten ὦ by Willink (2002) 63 with n. 40 = (2010) 399 with n. 40 (cf. (1999) 412 with n. 17 = (2010) 278 n. 17), who prints ὦ in second-person addresses, ὦ in exclamations. For tragic exclamations involving πόνος (prefaced by both ὦ and ἰώ) cf. *Ant.* 1276/7, Aesch. *Suppl.* 126, *Sept.* 739–40 ὦ πόνοι δόμων | νέοι παλαιοῖσι συμμιγείς κακοῖς, 994, *Ag.* 1167, *Cho.* 466, Eur. *Hipp.* 367, 1344, *Ar. Ach.* 1071 (paratragic). For the possibility that the word order needs to be changed see 1187/8–1191n.

1198 κείνος γὰρ ἔπερσεν ἀνθρώπους. 'He it was who destroyed humanity.' Cf. Prop. 2.6.29–30 (of the hand of the man who first painted immoral pictures) *illa puellarum ingenuos corruptit ocellos* | *nequitiaeque suae noluit esse rudis*. For πορθέω with a personal object see 896n.

1199–1202 ἐκεῖνος οὔτε στεφάνων οὔτε βαθειᾶν κυλίκων νείμει ἐμοὶ τέρψιν δμῖλεῖν ‘That man did not assign me the pleasure of garlands or deep cups to consort with’. The horrors of war contrast with the joys of the symposium: cf. Eur. fr. 453 *TrGF*, Stes. fr. 210 *PMGF*, Xenoph. fr. 1 *IEG*, Lyr. Adesp. fr. 1018(b).7 *PMG* στεφανηφόρον Εἰράναν. The symposium featured garlands round the drinkers’ heads (cf. Anacr. fr. 396, 410, 434 *PMG*, Xenoph. fr. 1.2 *IEG*, Philoxenus fr. 836(a).3, 836(b).43 *PMG*, Nisbet and Hubbard, commentary on Horace’s *Odes* 1, index s.v. ‘garlands, drinkers’, Blech (1982) 63–74) and *kylikes* to drink from (cf. Sappho fr. 2.14 Voigt, Alcaeus fr. 346.5–6, Pind. fr. 124.4 S–M, Critias D–K 88 B 1.6 = II 376.4, Pl. *Symp.* 214b).

Printing the transmitted text, as above, requires an extra syllable in the antistrophe, well supplied by αἶεν νυχίου for ἐννυχίου (*coni.* Wolff): αι could have dropped out before (and after) ε since the two sounded the same from the early Imperial period, and ἐννυχίαν in 1203/4 would have further encouraged the error. Triclinius’s μὲν <οὔν> (p. 25.5–8 Tessier) gives unclear sense. Hermann² leaves the antistrophe untouched and changes οὔτε to οὐ (for such a corruption prompted by following οὔτε cf. *OC* 702), which yields inferior metre (see the metrical analysis).

βαθειᾶν could be accented βαθεῖαν (as in many manuscripts), but word order suggests its agreement with κυλίκων (same phrase at Pherecr. fr. 152.4 *PCG*; cf. S. fr. 563.1–2 *TrGF* βαθύν | κρατῆρ’) rather than τέρψιν (cf. Pind. *O.* 7.53 κλέος βαθύ, LS⁸ s.v. βαθύς 1 3b). For the epexegetic infinitive (δμῖλεῖν) after a genitive cf. Stevens on Eur. *Andr.* 94, Bruhn §127.11.

1202/3–1203/4 οὔτε γλυκὺν αὐλῶν ὄτοβον δύσμορος, οὔτ’ ἐννυχίαν τέρψιν ἰαύειν ‘nor the sweet music of pipes, the wretch, or the pleasure of rest in the night.’ For the αὐλός in symposia see P. Wilson (1999) 82–5, Mankin (2001) 100–1 (images). In Plato’s *Symposium* the departure and arrival of the αὐλητρίς marks the move to and from philosophical discussion as opposed to symposiastic hedonism (176e, 212c; see further Murray (1990) 347 Index s.v. flute-players, -playing). In particular, the association of the female pipe-players with the availability of sexual favours (cf. Bundrick (2005) 38–9), together with the reference to ἐννυχία τέρψις (cf. Pind. *P.* 11.25 ἐννυχιοὶ πάραγον κοῖται, also in an erotic context), links thematically to ἔρωσ in the next line.

ὄτοβον is metrically guaranteed over the variant ὄτοβον; for the spelling see Porson on Eur. *Or.* 1386, Blomfield on [Aesch.] *PV* 591. For δύσμορος in reproach see 618–620/1n. Blaydes’s δυσμόρῳ (in his first edition, p. 337, comparing *OR* 665/6–666/7 ἀλλά μοι δυσμόρῳ γὰρ φθίνουσα τρύχει καρδίαν (*coni.*)) would give the adjective its usual sense, but an attack on the inventor is truer to the rhetorical focus (cf. prominent κείνος . . . ἐκεῖνος . . .).

ἰαύω means ‘pass the night’, whether in sleep or wakefulness, in Homer, Ibycus fr. S257(a).1 col. i.15–16 *PMGF*, and [Eur.] *Rhes.* 740, as well as here; elsewhere the sense is ‘sleep’, ‘rest abed’ (cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1538, *Her.* 1049 (*coni.*)).

1205/6 ἐρώτων δ' ἐρώτων ἀπέπαυσεν, ὧμοι. 'And from love, from love he has cut me off, *oimoi*.' The inventor of warfare has conquered the proverbially unconquerable power of love (see Davies's commentary on *Trachiniae*, pp. 137–8). For ἔρωσ denoting sexual pleasure (as opposed to sexual desire) Sommerstein (1999) 200 = (2009) 86 compares Ar. *Plut.* 190. The repetition may have a 'sad and serious tone' (Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 2.14.1, citing e.g. Sappho fr. 114.1 Voigt; even though their reference is to vocatives, it may hold for our passage). For a repeated word separated by a postpositive cf. 1215/16, where Hutchinson lists examples. Most manuscripts corrupt ἐρώτων δ' ἐρώτων (GRQ, *coni.* Bothe¹) to ἐρώτων. ἐρώτων δ', probably through a mistaken view of the syntax, itself doubtless encouraged by the specious attraction of the phrase τέρπιν . . . ἐρώτων. S's ἀπέπαυσέ μ' (*coni.* Blaydes¹; Dawe (1968) 13 points to the frequent occurrence of the personal pronoun as the chorus describe their misery) is probably a fussy attempt to supply an unnecessary direct object. ἀπέσπασέ μ' (N) and ἀπέσπασεν (Zr) show the substitution of a more vigorous (but unmetrical) verb. For the orthography of ὧμοι (Bothe¹) see 227/8–232n.

1207–1209/10 κείμει δ' ἀμέριμος οὕτως, | αἰὲ πικινᾷς δρόσοις | τεγγόμενος κόμας, | λυγρᾷς μνήματα Τροίας. 'I lie uncared for, just as I am, my hair continually drenched by the heavy dews – things to remember miserable Troy by.' The vivid picture of the soldiers' physical discomforts (599/600–605n.) balances the description of joys left behind.

ἀμέριμος is used in a passive sense; elsewhere we find the active 'free from care' (cf. Posid. *A.P.* 9.359.5 = 3184 *HE* = 133.5 A–B). For οὕτως with this meaning cf. *Ant.* 315, *Phil.* 1067, LSJ⁹ s.v. A IV; αὐτως at Hom. *Il.* 18.198, 18.338, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 2.11.14 *sic*. πικινός is attested elsewhere in tragedy only at *Phil.* 853/4 (lyr.); in both places the unmetrical variant πικν– shows corruption to the more usual tragic form. Comedy also uses πικνός, though with two exceptions (Epicharm. fr. 108.3 *PCG*, Eubulus fr. 37.2 *PCG* = 38.2 Hunter, which H. obelises); epic and lyric have both.

Dew is the bane of the outdoor sleeper: cf. Hom. *Od.* 5.466–8 εἰ μὲν κ' ἐν ποταμῷ δυσκηδέα νύκτα φυλάσσω, | μή μ' ἄμυδις στίβῃ τε κακῇ καὶ θῆλυς ἔέρση | ἐξ ὀλιγηπελὴς δαμάση κεκαφηότα θυμόν, Aesch. *Ag.* 12–13, 334–7, 558–62 (cited 599/600–605n.), Boedeker (1984) 66–73. λυγρᾷς (Brunck) is preferable to manuscript λυγρός: wretchedness is better predicated of Troy than the speaker's hair. This last phrase is in apposition to the rest of the sentence (as is [Simon.] *A.P.* 7.250.4 = 727 *FGE* ἀργαλὲς μνήματα ναυμαχίης; 558–9n.): 'the raindrops on my head will not let me forget that I am in this miserable country' (Campbell).

1211–13 καὶ πρὶν μὲν αἰὲν νυχίου δείματος ἦν μοι προβολὰ καὶ βελέων θούριος Αἴας. 'And in the past my perpetual protection against nightly fear

and arrows was furious Ajax.’ The soldiers looked to their lord for physical and emotional security. For bad dreams described in terms of fear see *El.* 410n. For the text of αἰὲν νυχίου see 1199–1201n. For προβολά with the genitive cf. *Eur. Or.* 1488a θανάτου προβολάν, K–G 1335–6. For θούριος of Ajax see 211–13n.

1214/15–1215/16 νῦν δ’ οὗτος ἀνείται στυγερῷ δαίμονι. ‘But now he is consecrated to a hateful fortune.’ The sense of ἀνείται is owed to Musgrave (‘devovetur, consecratur’): cf. *Eur. Phoen.* 947–8 οὗτος δὲ πῶλος τῇδ’ ἀνειμένος πόλῃ | θανῶν πατρῶαν γαῖαν ἐκσώσειεν ἄν (of Menoeceus), *Call. Hym.* 6.46 θεοῖσιν ἀνειμένα δένδρεα κόπτεις, *IPri* 112.115 (after 84 BC) . . . οἷς ὁ τόπος ἀνείται [θεοῖ]ς, *LSJ*⁹ s.v. ἀνίημι π 6. Hermann prefers simply ‘solutus est’ (comparing *Eur. Or.* 941 ὁ νόμος ἀνείται), but the accompanying dative makes the former preferable. The variant ἔγκειται, which gives neither sense nor metre, may have originated in a gloss (28n.); cf. Σ *Ar. Nub.* 956 (p. 183.14 Holwerda) ἀνείται καταλείπεται, δέδοται, κῆται. For the στυγερὸς δαίμων cf. *Hom. Od.* 5.396 στυγερὸς δὲ οἱ ἔχραε δαίμων (of a chronically sick man).

1215/16 τίς μοι, τίς ἐτ’ οὖν τέρψις ἐπέσται; ‘What, I ask, what pleasure still remains for me?’ For the word order W. Barrett (2007) 480 compares *Eur. Phoen.* 818 ἔτεκες, ὦ Γαῖ’, ἔτεκές ποτε; in each case words which tend to second place are found after both instances of a repeated first word. ἐπέσται with a welcome subject is paralleled by *Hom. Od.* 4.756–7 ἔτι πού τις ἐπέσσεται ὅς κεν ἔχῃσι | δώματά θ’ ὑπερεφέα καὶ ἀπόπροθι πίονας ἀγρούς, 6.210 ὅθ’ ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ’ ἀνέμοιο, *Hom. Hym.* 2.263 τιμὴ δ’ ἄφθιτος αἰὲν ἐπέσσεται, *Ar. Av.* 597 νυνὶ πλεῖ, κέρδος ἐπέσται; there is no need for ἐτ’ ἔσται (*coni.* Blaydes¹); for the corruption see FJ/W on *Aesch. Suppl.* 244).

1217/18–1221/2 γενοίμαν ἴν’ ὕλᾱεν ἔπεστι πόντῳ | πρόβλημ’ ἀλίκλυστον, ἄκραν | ὑπὸ πλάκα Σουνίου, | τὰς ἱεράς ὁπως | προσείποιμεν Ἀθᾶνας. ‘If only I were where the wooded, ocean-washed promontory is set over the sea, coming up to the flat hilltop of Sunium at land’s edge, so I could greet holy Athens.’ The chorus’s diatribe against their present circumstances culminates in a wish to escape; the detailed description of the locations suggests their affection, in contrast to the earlier bare references to Troy (1190, 1209/10). For similar fantasies by choruses in distress cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 732–4 ἡλιβάτοις ὑπὸ κευθμῶσι γενοίμαν, | ἵνα με πτεροῦσαν ὄρνιν | θεὸς ἐν ποταναῖς ἀγέλαις θεῖη with Barrett (‘γενοίμαν rather than εἶην is normal in these wishes, where the speaker is thinking rather of the immediate . . . change from his present state than of any continuance in the new one’), 1290–3, *Eur. IT* 1138–52, Padel (1974), L. Parker (1997) 340, M. Wright (2005) 219–20.

Sunium, the southernmost tip of Attica (*Hom. Od.* 3.278 Σούνιον ἱρὸν ἀφικόμεθ’, ἄκρον Ἀθηνῶν), would be the first part of that land approached by a ship returning from Troy to Athens or Salamis; its appearance would signal

the final leg of the journey and the imminence of home (cf. Burton (1980) 37). ὑπὸ with the accusative implies ‘motion up to and under’ (Moorhouse 129), as the sailors imagine the promontory looming into view. This view would not have included the still extant Doric temple of Poseidon, begun in the 440s (Goette (2000) 19–32; a previous temple was destroyed by the Persians in 480).

Sunium fits the geography of the prayer; it also has links to Salamis, home of the chorus. A branch of the Athenian γένος ‘Salaminioi’ came from Sunium, where they were responsible for a priest of Heracles (*SEG* 21 §527 = Rhodes and Osborne (2003) §37, 363/2 BC), and other prosopographical and onomastic evidence links known members of the *genos* to Salamis (Lambert (1999) 128–30). The origin of the connexion is disputed. One view assumes that Salaminians came to Athens in the submycenaean period, and that some were later selected to establish a cult at Sunium (Osborne (1994) 154–9); another that the γένος is the result of the settlement of Athenians on Salamis in the archaic or classical periods (Lambert (1997) 97–103). See further R. Parker (1996) 308–16, 347, Rhodes and Osborne (2003) 193. For our purposes, the synchronic picture is more important than the diachronic: whatever its origin, the prominence of a γένος at Sunium called ‘Salaminioi’ would have led S.’s audience to assume a close link between the deme and the island, and thus to regard Sunium as an especially appropriate place for a Salaminian chorus to invoke. One further piece of evidence connects the places: of the three Phoenician triremes dedicated by the Greeks after the battle of Salamis, one was dedicated at Salamis, one at Sunium (Hdt. 8.121.1).

Instead of ὑλᾶεν several manuscripts have ὑλῶεν, perhaps through confusion with ὑλῶδης. Since ἔπεστι requires a dative, πόντῳ (*coni.* Morstadt (1864) 47) must be preferred to transmitted πόντου; for the association of this noun with πρόβλημα cf. *Phil.* 14.55 κτύπος ἄρσην πόντου προβολῆς. Supporters of the paradosis impossibly take the noun with πρόβλημα while also understanding πόντῳ with the verb. ἄκραν primarily refers to the position of Sunium at the tip of Attica (thus ἄκρον in Hom. *Od.* 3.278 cited above), but may also convey the height of the cliff as seen from a boat below. For the unusual prosody of ὑπὸ πλάκᾳ (long second syllable), eased by the close connexion of the preposition to its noun, see *El.* 853n.

A returning traveller may greet or otherwise invoke the land from which he has long been separated: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 503–4 ἰὼ πατρίων οὐδας Ἀργείας χθονός, | δεκάτῳ σε φέγγει τῷδ’ ἀφικόμην ἔτους, Eur. *Or.* 356–7, Ar. *Ach.* 266/7 ἔκτωρ σ’ ἔτει προσείπον εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἐλθὼν ἄσμενος, Virg. *Aen.* 3.524 *Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant* (referring to a future homeland), Cat. 31.12 *salve, o venusta Sirmio*. Either Sunium stands for Athens and Attica as a whole, and so prompts the greeting, or its appearance indicates that Athens is not far off. There is no question of the chorus’s being able to see Athens from Sunium, a distance of some thirty miles. In S.’s day, the most someone could

have discerned from that spot would have been the spear-point and crest of Phidias' colossal bronze statue of Athena on the Acropolis, if Pausanias was right to say that it was visible to sailors as they came from Sunium (1.28.2). This statue was probably completed c. 450 (cf. *IG* 1³ 435, Davison (2009) 1279), perhaps before our play.

Athens is 'holy' in a range of genres: cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.323, Pind. fr. 75.4 S–M, Olson on Ar. *Pax* 1033–6. The adjective is applied to Sunium itself in Hom. *Od.* 3.278. For the optative προσείποιμεν after an optative of wish in primary sequence see K–G 1256, Goodwin §181, Moorhouse 286–7.

EXODOS (1223–1420)

1223–1373 A second *agon* dominates the *exodos*, conveying by repetition the unremitting threat which Teucer faces. The recurrence of this form also balances and contrasts with the repeated monologues (or virtual monologues) which provided an important structural element during the central section (430–865). There is no parallel for successive *agones*; among other tragedies, only Euripides' *Andromache* has more than one, and these are widely separated and involve different pairs of characters (147–272, 547–746). Most nearly comparable are the successive confrontations which make up the first part of S.'s *Electra*, where the protagonist's increasingly hostile encounters with chorus, Chrysothemis, and Clytemnestra are played out in successively more antagonistic formats, only the last of which is a full-scale *agon* (*El.* 516–633n.).

The content shows surprising variety, even though the situation remains unchanged. Agamemnon's speech has a quite different focus from his brother's, and is even less rhetorically distinguished (1226–63n.), while Teucer's response scores a more convincing victory than before (1266–1315n.). The conclusion of the debate shows a 'sophisticated variation on a standard form' (M. Lloyd (1992) 12); instead of the usual stichomythia between the participants, Odysseus enters, and, after a brief exchange with Agamemnon, delivers a speech expounding principles which ought to have been heard long before (1332–45). Stichomythia ensues, but between Agamemnon and Odysseus, not Teucer (1346–69); Odysseus as it were usurps the latter's functions in the *agon*, and thanks to his position and his arguments achieves for Ajax what Teucer never could.

1223–4 Teucer enters from eisodos A; Agamemnon is seen approaching from the same direction, with attendants. The double entry is unprecedented. Elsewhere two characters enter from the same direction when they accompany each other (Taplin (1977) 241), or appear simultaneously but separately from different entrances (*ibid.* 149). Only here do two characters enter separately,

but from the same direction. This increases the urgency, with Teucer arriving ‘just in time to intercept the approach of Agamemnon’ (Taplin (1978) 149).

καὶ μὴν ἰδὼν ἔσπευσα τὸν στρατηλάτην | Ἀγαμέμνον’ ἡμῖν δεῦρο τόνδ’ ὁρμώμενον. ‘Look, I have made haste, as I saw the general Agamemnon advancing here towards us.’ καὶ μὴν regularly introduces a new arrival (1168–70n.), but is normally spoken by someone already present. Wrongly assuming that καὶ μὴν is adversative (‘doch’), Morstadt (1864) 47 suggests that a preceding speech by the chorus has dropped out; Dawe, *STS* 1 168–9, attributes καὶ μὴν to the chorus, followed by a lacuna of two lines in which the chorus announce the arrival of Teucer and Agamemnon, and which extends into the beginning of Teucer’s speech. But a double announcement of Agamemnon’s entry would slow the pace. H’s attribution of 1223–5 to the chorus, an easy slip, since the chorus often deliver such introductions, provides no support for Morstadt’s idea. For στρατηλάτης see 56–8n.

1225 δῆλος δέ μοῦστί σκαιὸν ἐκλύσων στόμα. ‘It’s clear to me that he’s going to let loose some stupid talk.’ For (ἐκ)λύω of unrestrained speech, for good or ill, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1060 τί δῆτα τοῦμόν οὐ λύω στόμα;, Critias eleg. fr. B6.8–9 *IEG* γλώσσας τε λύουσιν [Musurus: τέλειουσιν codd.] | εἰς αἰσχροῦς μύθους, Isocr. 12.96 ἐπελήλυθε μοι τὸ παρρησιάζεσθαι καὶ λέλυκε τὸ στόμα, Ov. *Met.* 3.261 *linguam ad iurgia solvit*, Tarrant on Sen. *Ag.* 718. For σκαιός ‘stupid’ see 183–5n.

μοῦστί (contracted from μο-εστί after elimination of intervocalic iota) for manuscript μοῖστί is owed to Elmsley (1814) 485; for the error cf. *Phil.* 812, Eur. *Ba.* 1257, *IA* 828, Ar. fr. 480.1 *PCG*. Of the alternatives, the forms with crasis are the more probably original than those involving prodelision, since the former is notoriously a cause of corruption (39n.). Moreover, while prodelision of ἐστί is ‘very frequent’ in drama (Platnauer (1960) 143), there are no secure cases of –οι causing prodelision except in the exclamation οἱ γῶ (*ibid.* p. 142).

The variant καὶ δῆλός ἐστιν ὥς τι σημαῖων νέον is a portmanteau line merging 326 καὶ δῆλός ἐστιν ὥς τι δρασεῖων κακόν with *Ant.* 242 δηλοῖς δ’ ὥς τι σημαῖων νέον. In L the variant is introduced by δι^x, i.e. διχῶς (*El.* 28n.).

1226–63 From its first word (σέ) Agamemnon’s speech is largely an attack on Teucer, expressed with fury (1226–8), and descending at times into coarse vocabulary (1236) and low threats (1255–6). He berates his audacity (1226–7, 1236, 1258), insignificance (1231), and arrogance (1236); calls him a slave (1235, 1259–61) and attacks his parentage (1229–30, 1262–3; cf. Ebbott (2003) 37–65); and accuses him of not accepting defeat (1242–5). Menelaus’ speech, by contrast, focussed on Ajax; only in the subsequent stichomythia did he turn to personal abuse. When Agamemnon does engage with more substantive matters, he is no more adept than his brother. He misrepresents Teucer’s case through exaggeration (1232–3), dismissing it as the product of servile insolence

(1235) rather than employing argument. He equates his prowess in battle with Ajax's (1236–8), a suspect assertion which Teucer will rebut. He points to the majority verdict of the judges (1243), a fair point in itself, but irrelevant to the main issue. A sententious passage on the importance of having things in their proper place (1246–54; cf. 1071–86) absurdly implies that Ajax was all brawn and no brain; even Athena never questioned Ajax's intelligence (119–20).

Yet he never mentions the key point, Ajax's burial. Even Menelaus managed to defend the exposure of his corpse by citing his attack on the army (1052–65); Agamemnon refers to neither. His comments about Teucer's refusal to submit to the verdict in the Judgment of the Arms (1239–45) focusses on a different grievance, and one rendered moot by Ajax's suicide. This combination of vituperation and irrelevance offers Teucer the prospect of an easy victory, at least in the debate; but Agamemnon does not need to win the argument to enforce his will.

1226–8 Agamemnon enters from eisodos A, with attendants (cf. 1040n.).

σέ δὴ τὰ δεινὰ ῥήματ' ἀγγέλλουσί μοι | τλήναι καθ' ἡμῶν ὧδ' ἀνοιμωκ-
τεῖ χανεῖν | σέ τοι, τὸν ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωτίδος λέγω. 'You there! They tell me you've dared to open your mouth with those dreadful words against us – unscathed. Yes, I mean you, the captive woman's son!' The fronted second person accusative singular marks a brusque address (71–2n.), an effect accentuated by repetition, emphatic δὴ (Denniston 208), and τοι (*ibid.* 542). For τὰ see 312–13n. ἡμῶν denotes Agamemnon and Menelaus (cf. 1233).

ἀνοιμωκτεῖ is a stronger version of ἀκλαυτος (*El.* 912); for the implied threat cf. *OC* 820 (Creon) τὰχ' ἔξεις μᾶλλον οἰμῶζειν τάδε, *Ar. Nub.* 217, *Plut.* 111. There is no secure criterion for deciding between –εῖ and –ί in such adverbs (listed and discussed at S–D 1 623; cf. West's edition of the *Iliad*, 1 p. xxx); I print –εῖ except when a short syllable is required (so ἀστακτί at *OC* 1251, but ἀστακτεῖ at 1646). For χάσσω 'yawn, gape' used (pejoratively) of speech cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 919–20 μηδὲ βαρβάρου φωτὸς δίκην | χαμαιπετὲς βόαμα προσχάνης ἔμοι (as here, predicated of a 'barbarian'), *Ar. Vesp.* 342 τοῦτ' ἐτόλμησ' ὁ μιὰρὸς χανεῖν; Accius *Armorum Iudicium* 157 Ribbeck *hem, vereor plus quam fas est captivum hiscere* (perhaps modelled on this passage). αἰχμαλωτίς, 'female prisoner of war', occurs elsewhere at Eur. *Tro.* 28. For λέγω 'I mean' see 104n.

Instead of τὸν ἐκ, individual manuscripts offer σέ τόν, σέ τὸν ἐκ, and σέ τόν (without τῆς). σέ could have intruded thanks to a belief that one repetition of the peremptory pronoun was not enough; or ἐκ could be an intrusive gloss (28n.). Weight of manuscript evidence is our best guide; cf. Dawe, *STS* 1 169, comparing 1289 for the preposition.

Some editors print a question mark after χανεῖν, but the statement makes better sense.

1229–30 ἡ που τραφεῖς ἄν μητρὸς εὐγενοῦς ἄπο | ὑψηλ' ἐφώνεις κάπ' ἄκρων ὠδοιπόροις 'I suppose if you'd been born from a noble mother you'd be talking loftily and walking round on tip-toe.' The attack on an individual's mother is a stock insult in comedy and oratory (see Dem. 18.130, 57.30, Süss (1910) 248–9, Dover (1974) 32). *A fortiori* ἡ (Denniston 281–2) vouches for the hypothetical situation; for ἡ που see 176n. For τρέφομαι 'be born' see 556–7n. κάπ' ἄκρων ὠδοιπόροις suggests a ridiculous and impractical posture aimed at making the walker seem taller and more important (balancing the metaphorical idea of height in ὑψηλ' ἐφώνεις); cf. Liban. *Decl.* 30.10 (v1 623.8–9 Foerster) οἱ μὲν ἐπ' ἄκρων πορεύονται δακτύλων (of servants emboldened by fortune). Similar expressions convey a range of meanings: cf. Eur. *El.* 840 ὄνυχας ἔπ' ἄκρους (a man preparing to strike a blow), *IT* 266 ἄκροισι δακτύλοισι (a man hurrying quietly), *Ion* 1166 ἐν δ' ἄκροισι βᾶς ποσίν (a herald about to speak), fr. 570 *TrGF* ἀκρίζων (defined by Hesychius α 2564 = 1 91 Latte as ἄκροισ ποσίν ἐπιπορεύμενος), Ar. *Ach.* 638 ἐπ' ἄκρων τῶν πυγιδίων (an audience 'in anticipation and excitement': Olson), Posid. *A.Pl.* 275.3 = 3156 *HE* = 142.3 A–B ἐπ' ἄκρα βέβηκας (a statue in running posture).

ἐφώνεις becomes unmetrical ἐφρόνεις through a common corruption (cf. *OR* 72, 324, *El.* 213; also Aesch. *Suppl.* 617) encouraged by ὑψηλ' (cf. φρονέω at 761). Triclinius's ἐκόμπεις is presumably an emendation (Σ Ar. *Ach.* 638c = p. 84 Wilson, where it is also found, is part of a Triclinian recension, as N. Wilson (1976) 174 notes; Nauck^{5a} refers to a Sophoclean manuscript with this as a γράφεται variant) aimed at introducing a more obvious word for boasting (cf. 766, 770).

1231 δὲ οὐδὲν ὦν τοῦ μηδὲν ἀντέστης ὕπερ 'when you in your worthlessness have taken a stand for the dead man'. For this sense of οὐδὲν ὦν see Moorhouse (1965) 31–5 (though on *El.* 245 see my n.). For τοῦ μηδὲν referring to a specific individual (instead of the expected generic sense) see Moorhouse (1965) 37–40; in S. and Euripides μηδεῖς, μηδὲν encroach on οὐδεῖς, οὐδὲν in such expressions. For τοῦ μηδὲν 'the dead man' cf. *El.* 1165–7 (Electra, to the supposedly dead Orestes) τοιγὰρ σὺ δέξαι μ' ἐς τὸ σὸν τόδε στέγος, | τὴν μηδὲν ἐς τὸ μηδὲν, ὥς σὺν σοὶ κάτω | ναίω τὸ λοιπόν ('Receive me . . . I who am nothing into your nothingness', with 'nothing' in each case standing for death) and *Ant.* 1325, where Creon describes himself as τὸν οὐκ ὄντα μᾶλλον ἢ μηδὲνα ('the man who is not alive, but rather dead'; cf. Jebb's 'whose life is but as death'). For the distinction in sense between juxtaposed οὐδὲν ὦν and τοῦ μηδὲν cf. the different distinction at Eur. fr. 532 *TrGF* τοὺς ζῶντας εὐ δρᾶν· κατθανὼν δὲ πᾶς ἀνὴρ | γῆ καὶ σκιά· τὸ μηδὲν εἰς οὐδὲν ῥέπει, where the sense is something like 'the dead man falls into nothingness', with τὸ μηδὲν corresponding to κατθανὼν . . . ἀνὴρ and οὐδὲν to γῆ καὶ σκιά. Moorhouse (1965) 36 (cf. p. 339 of his *Syntax*) takes a different view of *El.* 1165–7 and *Ant.*

1235. In the former he translates τὴν μηδέν as ‘in extremity, as good as dead’; but by relying on the literal truth that Electra is alive, he misses how Electra here speaks of herself as already dead (cf. 1152, with Finglass (2009f) 342). In the latter he prefers ‘the one who is dead (οὐκ ἔστι)’ rather than at the final extremity’, an opposition at once frigid and obscure.

We should reject an alternative sense for τοῦ μηδέν, ‘the worthless man’ (766–9n.; thus Moorhouse (1965) 37), for three reasons. (i) Agamemnon is attacking Teucer, not Ajax. He denies that Ajax’s achievements surpassed those of other Greeks, including his own (1236–8), and implies that he relied on mere brawn rather than brain (1250–4). But he nowhere denies Ajax’s prowess or his contribution to the Greek cause. In the stichomythia with Odysseus, Agamemnon refers several times to Ajax simply as ‘the dead man’, ‘the corpse’ (cf. 1326, 1348, 1356, 1364). (ii) In the midst of an attack on Teucer, Agamemnon cannot make a bare, unelaborated, first reference to Ajax as ‘the worthless man’. The rhetorical emphasis is on Teucer’s insignificance. (iii) Agamemnon’s taunt at 1257–8 parallels and elaborates 1231: why is Teucer defiant when his protector Ajax is dead? In each passage Agamemnon is concerned with the fact of Ajax’s death, not an evaluation of his worth.

1232–4 κοῦτε στρατηγούς οὔτε ναυάρχους μολεῖν | ἡμᾶς Ἀχαιῶν οὔτε σοῦ διωμόσω, | ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἄρχων, ὥς σὺ φῆς, Αἴας ἐπλεῖ. ‘and you have sworn that we came here with no authority on land or sea over the Achaeans or over you, but Ajax sailed as his own commander, as you claim.’ Agamemnon refers to Teucer’s words at 1097–1104, 1107–8; we infer that Menelaus has informed him of their conversation. But Teucer never denies the authority of the Atridae over the Greeks as a whole.

The variant ναύαρχας is accusative plural of ναύαρχης, a Byzantine alternative to ναύαρχος. In 1233, instead of οὔτε Blaydes¹ plausibly suggests οὐδέ. For Teucer’s supposed oath see 648–9n.; the lack of an oath may have prompted the minority variant διωρίσω, which gives the wrong sense (‘determined’). Through ὥς σὺ φῆς Agamemnon dissociates himself from Teucer’s claim (cf. *OC* 940, *Phil.* 1028, *Dem.* 19.221, Mastronarde on *Eur. Phoen.* 467). For the vocalism and accent of φῆς see 791n.

1235 ταῦτ’ οὐκ ἀκούειν μεγάλα πρὸς δούλων κακά; ‘Are not these monstrous taunts to hear from slaves?’ (Trevelyan). Teucer describes earlier how Telamon will treat him as a δοῦλος (1020); here the word picks up αἰχμαλωτίδος (1228), and suggests Agamemnon’s excessive sense of his own authority (cf. Creon referring to Antigone as a δοῦλος at *Ant.* 479), the very fault that he ascribes to Teucer. For rhetorical attacks on the social background of an opponent see Alcaeus fr. 348 Voigt, Davies (1985) 33–4. For πρὸς denoting the origin of something heard cf. *Phil.* 1074–5 ἀκούσομαι μὲν ὥς ἔφυν οἴκτου πλέως | πρὸς τοῦδ’; also *Eur. Held.* 718 Ζεὺς ἐξ ἑμοῦ μὲν οὐκ ἀκούσεται κακῶς.

1236–7 ποίου κέκραγας ἀνδρὸς ᾧδ’ ὑπέρφρονα, | ποῦ βάντος ἢ ποῦ στάντος οὐπερ οὐκ ἐγώ; ‘What kind of man are you shouting your proud words about? Where did he go or stand that I didn’t?’ Teucer rebuts this claim by referring to specific incidents (1272–89) which Agamemnon never denies. The polar opposition ποῦ βάντος ἢ ποῦ στάντος (cf. *Phil.* 833–4 ὅρα ποῦ στάση, | ποῖ δὲ βάση, Eur. *Alc.* 863, *Hec.* 1057, Hom. *Od.* 17.158, West (2007) 101) stresses the magnitude of Agamemnon’s claim: he can match every one of Ajax’s achievements on the battlefield.

κράζω, κέκραγα (the perfect, with past or present sense, is much commoner than the present) denotes the loud noise of animals such as crows (fr. 208.6 *TrGF*) or frogs (Ar. *Ran.* 258a). It is transferred to loud and undisciplined human utterances, especially in comedy (see Olson on Ar. *Ach.* 335) and oratory (Wankel on Dem. 18.132). Apart from our passage and fr. 208.6, it appears in tragedy only at [Aesch.] *PV* 743 (of the laments of Io, a girl in the form of a cow) and Aesch. fr. 281(d).5 (of Boreas, possibly from a satyr-play). Agamemnon’s use of the term, the only tragic instance applied to normal human speech, insults Teucer and demeans himself thanks to its low register. The variant κέκραγες shows confusion of perfect and strong aorist endings. For the genitive without περί see *El.* 317n.

In place of the former ποῦ (supported by 1281) we find ποῖ in *Dresdensis* Da. 22 (*coni.* Valckenaer (pre-1775); for the corruption cf. 1308, *El.* 1409, *Ant.* 42, *OC* 335, Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 9, and, in reverse, 1290) and πῇ in *Zr* (also an erroneous variant for ποῦ in the *Birds* passage); but ποῦ regularly denotes motion towards as well as motion at (cf. 1308). The minority variant ἤπερ is no more probable.

1238 οὐκ ἄρ’ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄνδρες εἰσὶ πλὴν ὁδε; ‘Have the Achaeans, then, no men but him?’ (cf. Jebb). For ἄρα see 738–9n. For ἄνδρες see 77n.

1239–41 πικροὺς ἔοιγμεν τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὅπλων | ἀγῶνας Ἀργείοισι κηρῦξαι τότε, | εἰ πανταχοῦ φανούμεθ’ ἐκ Τεύκρου κακοί ‘Bitter indeed, it seems, was the contest for the arms of Achilles which we proclaimed to the Argives at that time, if thanks to Teucer we are everywhere to be seen as base.’ Agamemnon’s sarcasm (cf. Men. *Epir.* 1069 κρίνομαι πρὸς Σωφρόνην;) is highlighted by predicative πικροὺς (*El.* 470n., adding A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 853–4). ἔοιγμεν is a tragic/satyrical, perhaps archaic, form (cf. fr. 314.101 *TrGF*, Eur. *Cycl.* 99, *Held.* 427, 681, perhaps Aesch. *Suppl.* 950 (*coni.*), S–D 1 769, Collard (2005a) 377); comedy and prose have εἰκόαμεν (Com. *Adesp.* fr. 1105.40 *PCG* (perhaps), Plato, [Demosthenes], Aristotle). For Ἀχιλλείων replacing a genitive see 41n. For the genitive in ὅπλων ἀγῶνας see Willink on Eur. *Or.* 812 χρυσέας ἔρις ἄρνός. For τότε see 650–2n. φανούμεθ’ and the other futures in 1241–9 mean ‘is to’ or ‘is going to be allowed to’ (Headlam on Herodas 2.24). The verb suggests appearance rather than reality (1019–20n.).

1242–3 κούκ ἄρκεσει ποθ' ὕμιν οὐδ' ἥσσημένοις | εἶκειν ἅ τοῖς πολλοῖσιν ἥρεσκεν κριταῖς 'and it will never be enough for you, even when defeated, to yield to the will of a majority of the judges'. For the vote see 1135–7n. Despite syntactic dependence on εἰ, the negative employed is οὐ, because the sense is causal, not conditional (Moorhouse 322). For ὕμιν (thus Schneidewin¹ for manuscript ὕμιν; Zb^s has ὕμιν) see 216–17n. For ἥσσάομαι used unqualified of a legal defeat see Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 1.2 (p. 170). ἅ is short for ταῦτα ἅ, with a cognate accusative as at *OC* 172 εἶκοντας ἅ δεῖ, 1178 τάδ' εἰκαθεῖν. For τοῖς πολλοῖσιν 'the majority' see LSJ⁹ s.v. πολὺς π 3 b.

1244–5 ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἡμᾶς ἡ κακοῖς βαλεῖτέ που | ἡ σὺν δόλῳ κεντήσεθ' οἱ λειψυμένοι. 'but you, the losers, will always shower us with abuse, I suppose, or stab at us from ambush' (similarly Lloyd-Jones). Agamemnon expects continual opposition from Teucer, whether in the open or in secret; for αἰεῖ as a typical word in quarrels see *El.* 516n. For λείπομαι 'be inferior to' cf. *Ti.* 266 τῶν ὦν τέκνων λείποιτο πρὸς τόξου κρίσιν, LSJ⁹ s.v. λείπω β π 3. Dawe, *STS* 1 169–70, rejects the minority variant λελυμένοι (H, *coni.* Pearson (1920) 57, citing Aesch. *Pers.* 344 for the corruption): 'Teucer and Ajax have not been either "caught" or "convicted" . . . but Ajax came second best, and protested.'

1246–7 ἐκ τῶνδε μέντοι τῶν τρόπων οὐκ ἂν ποτε | κατάστασις γένοιτ' ἂν οὐδενὸς νόμου 'As a consequence of such behaviour there could never be a firm establishment of any law'. For emphatic μέντοι after a demonstrative see 952–3n. The noun κατάστασις (in place of e.g. οὐδεὶς ἂν κατασταίῃ νόμος) 'concentrates attention on the need to make the institution of law permanent' (Long (1968) 73), by stressing the state rather than the action. The term is often found in a legislative or political context: cf. 1074 (Menelaus, of δέος), *Ant.* 1113 τοὺς καθεστῶτας νόμους (thus Creon, admitting his transgression), Rhodes on [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 42.1 ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας, Long (1968) 72 n. 35, LSJ⁹ s.vv. κατάστασις ι ι, καθίστημι ιι 2b.

1248–9 εἰ τοὺς δίκη νικῶντας ἐξωθήσομεν | καὶ τοὺς ὀπισθεν εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν ἄξομεν. 'if we are to thrust the rightful winners aside, and bring the rearmost to the front' (Jebb). For the 'timeless' present participle νικῶντας cf. 1280, 1288, *El.* 200, Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 327–31. ὠθέω has the future ὠθήσω at Eur. *Cycl.* 592 and Ar. *Ecl.* 300, whereas elsewhere it is ὥσω; for alternative futures see Willi (2003) 250. Some manuscripts offer ἐξωθήσομεν, which breaks Porson's Law; for errors involving word division see 177–8n. The chaotic reversal described in 1249 is reminiscent of Hdt. 8.89.2 (of the Persian fleet at Salamis) οἱ γὰρ ὀπισθε τεταγμένοι, ἐς τὸ πρόσθε τῇσι νηυσὶ παριέναι περὶώμενοι . . . περιέπιπτον.

1250 ἀλλ' εἰρκτέον τάδ' ἐστίν· 'No, this must be stopped.' For the breathing of εἰρκτέον see 752–5n.

1250–6 Agamemnon employs a paratactic comparison, which he nevertheless formally connects to the present situation via καὶ σοί in 1255 (thus Friis Johansen (1959) 32–3, comparing e.g. *OC* 607–13).

1250–2 οὐ γὰρ οἱ πλατεῖς | οὐδ' εὐρύνωτοι φῶτες ἀσφαλέστατοι, | ἀλλ' οἱ φρονούντες εὖ κρατοῦσι πανταχοῦ. 'For it is not burly or broad-backed mortals who are most reliable – no, it is men of intelligence who everywhere prevail.' Agamemnon's words echo Calchas' statement at 758–61 (n.); but his speech does not demonstrate the φρόνησις which he enjoins on others (1226–63n.). The rejection of πλάτος in favour of intelligence is paralleled by [Simon.] 898 *FGE* οὐ πλάτει νικῶν σώματος ἀλλὰ τέχνη; cf. also Cic. *Sen.* 17 *non viribus aut velocitate aut celeritate corporum res magnae geruntur, sed consilio auctoritate sententia*. For πλατύς of a warrior cf. Theocr. 24.80 ἀπὸ στέρνων πλατύς ἦρως with Gow. εὐρύνωτοι suggests the Homeric description of Ajax as ἔξοχος Ἀργεῖων κεφαλὴν ἡδ' εὐρέας ὦμους (*Il.* 3.227), and leads into the following ox comparison.

1253–4 μέγας δὲ πλευρὰ βοῦς ὑπὸ σμικρᾶς ὁμῶς | μάστιγος ὀρθὸς εἰς ὁδὸν πορεύεται. 'A large-whipped ox nevertheless takes a straight course under the influence of a small whip.' Tecmessa earlier compared Ajax to a groaning bull (321–2), as an exemplar of quiet determination. Agamemnon, by contrast, focusses on the power relationship between the animal and its master; cf. *Ant.* 477–8 σμικρῷ χαλινῷ δ' οἶδα τοὺς θυμουμένους | ἵππους καταρτυθέντας, where another tyrant, Creon, describes his foe with a similarly unsympathetic zoological metaphor. In each case, the smallness of the controlling technology emphasises the superiority of the intellectual. At Hom. *Il.* 11.548–65 Ajax is compared to a lion, then a stubborn donkey; in both similes numerous smaller combatants check the larger animal, and the transition back to the narrative refers to Ajax's size (563 μέγαν). For people compared to oxen more generally cf. fr. 563.2–3 *TrGF* ὅδ' ἀνὴρ οὐ πρὶν ἂν φάγη καλῶς | ὁμοία καὶ βοῦς ἐργάτης ἐργάζεται. For the course of the ploughing animal cf. Philip *A.P.* 9.274.1–2 = 2945–6 *GP* καὶ τὸν ἀρουραῖον γυρητόμον αὐλακα τέμνει | μηροτυπεῖ κέντρον πειθομένη δάμαλις.

Instead of πλευρὰ (accusative plural of πλευρόν), some manuscripts offer πλευράν or πλευράς (accusative singular and plural of πλευρά); for other errors of gender with this word cf. Eur. *Held.* 824, *Ba.* 1126. Here metre does not help us, and even the singular is possible (cf. *OC* 1260); we may as well adopt the best attested reading. The other variant, πλευρᾶ, is meaningless; this word was a tempting target for wayward circumflexes (cf. *ADR* at 1410; Aesch. *Eum.* 843, 876).

For causal ὑπὸ cf. 1025–6, Moorhouse 129 ('the local sense [i.e. 'under'] is still sensible'), FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 595. πορεύεται has the passive sense described by Pearson on fr. 142 col. ii 21 (= Eur. fr. 727c.45 *TrGF*); cf. *Tr.* 391–2

ὄδ' ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἐμῶν ὑπ' ἀγγέλων | ἀλλ' αὐτόκλητος ἐκ δόμων πορεύεται. **1**
follows σμικρᾶς with δ', giving 'An ox is big-ribbed: but nevertheless . . .', with
unwelcome suddenness.

Either a μάστιξ ('whip') or κέντρον ('goad') can guide a ploughing ox.
Agamemnon characteristically employs the more violent implement, one used
in Athens to enforce public order (cf. A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 932–4); now Ajax's
enemy wields against him his own preferred instrument of torture (239–42).
For ὀρθὸς εἰς cf. Ar. *Pax* 161 ὀρθὸς [v.l. –ῶς] χῶρει Διὸς εἰς αὐλάς, Eur. *Ba.*
1073.

1255–6 καὶ σοὶ προσέρπον τοῦτ' ἐγὼ τὸ φάρμακον | ὀρῶ τάχ', εἰ μὴ νοῦν
κατακτήσῃ τινά. 'And I see this remedy coming to you soon, if you don't get
some sense.' For the minatory future in the protasis see Moorhouse 277. Pindar
describes the bridle with which Bellerophon masters Perseus as a φάρμακον
πραῦ (*O.* 13.85). For expressions related to νοῦν κατακτάσμαι see Fraenkel on
Aesch. *Ag.* 175 τεύζεται φρενῶν τὸ πᾶν.

1257–8 ὃς τάνδρός οὐκέτ' ὄντος, ἀλλ' ἤδη σκιάς, | θαρσῶν ὑβρίζεις κά-
ελευθεροστομεῖς. 'You who have the audacity, when the man is no longer
alive, but already a shadow, to utter your insults and speak as if you were
free!' Cf. 1231n., [Aesch.] *PV* 178–80 σὺ μὲν θρασύς τε καὶ πικραῖς δούαισιν
οὐδὲν ἐπιχαλᾷς, | ἄγαν δ' ἐλευθεροστομεῖς, Aesch. *Ag.* 1399 θαυμάζομέν σου
γλώσσαν, ὡς θρασύστομος. The genitives are absolute, not accompanied by
ὑπέρ understood. Agamemnon is outraged not at Teucer's support for a dead
man *per se*, but at his boldness in speaking out when Ajax, his protector, is now
dead. τάνδρός (Wecklein⁶ p. 55 or earlier) is thus essential, since transmitted
ἀνδρός means 'when a man is dead'. Most manuscripts show the same mistake
at 806; for errors caused by crasis see 39n. For σκιά of the dead see *El.* 1159n.
For ὕβρις see 151–3n. For –στομεῖν compounds in tragedy see *El.* 597n.

In 1258 Agamemnon's outrage is marked by the ascending tricolon and three
word trimeter (*El.* 13n.; not counting καί in crasis); his last word leads into the
concluding section on Teucer's allegedly servile status. Without παρρησία,
the ability to speak one's mind even when giving offence, a man, though free,
was to that extent a slave (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 421–5, *Ion* 673–5, *Phoen.* 391–2, FJ/W
on Aesch. *Suppl.* 948–9).

1259 οὐ σωφρονήσεις; 'Won't you come to your senses?' The majority reading
'is better suited . . . to denote recognition of personal limitations' (Dawe, *STS*
1 170) than εὖ φρονήσεις, which (Dawe suggests) may have arisen from οἱ
φρονούντες εὖ in 1252. αὖ φρονήσεις above the line in L probably shows a
further stage in the corruption.

1259–61 οὐ μαθὼν ὃς εἰ φύσιν | ἄλλον τιν' ἄξεις ἄνδρα δεῦρ' ἐλεύθερον, |
ὅστις πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀντὶ σοῦ λέξει τὰ σά; 'Won't you realise who you are, and

bring someone else here, a free man, to speak your case to me in your place?’ The slave ‘had no independent procedural capacity’ (Todd (1993) 187), and so needed a προστάτης to speak on his behalf in court: cf. *OR* 408–11 (Tiresias to Oedipus) εἰ καὶ τυραννεῖς, ἐξισωτέον τὸ γοῦν | ἴσ’ ἀντιλέξαι· . . . | οὐ γάρ τι σοὶ ζῶ δοῦλος, ἀλλὰ Λοξίξ’ | ὥστ’ οὐ Κρέοντος προστάτου γεγράφομαι, *Tr.* Adesp. fr. 304 *TrGF* δοῦλος πέφυκας, οὐ μέτεστί σοι λόγου, *Ter. Phorm.* 292–3 *servum hominem causam orare leges non sinunt* | *neque testimoni dictiost*, Hall (1989) 176, Olson on *Ar. Pax* 683–4. (Even a metic probably did not need to rely on his προστάτης to plead in court: Hansen (1999) 118.) For hostile exhortations similar to μαθὼν ὅς εἰ φύσιν see Headlam on *Herodas* 2.28. For the final-consecutive use of the future (λέξει) see 470–2n.

1262–3 σοῦ γὰρ λέγοντος οὐκέτ’ ἂν μάθοιμ’ ἐγώ· | τὴν βάρβαρον γὰρ γλῶσσαν οὐκ ἔπαίω. ‘I could not understand if you spoke, since I don’t know the barbarian language.’ Greeks believed that their superiority over the barbarians was apparent in λόγος (cf. Hall (1989) 200; also the insult at *Tr.* Adesp. fr. 696 *TrGF* βαρβαρόστομε, and *Ar. Ran.* 674–82, where the chorus implies that Cleophon speaks Thracian, or has a Thracian accent). Even if Teucer were imagined to have an accent or other foreign indications in his speech (and Agamemnon’s tendentious remarks provide no evidence of this), tragedy would not attempt to represent these (cf. Colvin (1999) 74–87, Csapo (2002) 140–1). For attacks on the allegedly non-Greek origin of an opposing speaker cf. *Aeschin.* 2.78, *Dinarch.* 1.15, 1.95, Süss (1910) 248. οὐκέτι means ‘not’ (*El.* 611n.); ‘no longer’ is not appropriate, since Agamemnon has been talking since he entered.

Some scholars (e.g. those cited by Scodel (2003) 32–3 n. 8) have seen a reference to the Periclean citizenship law of 451/0, which limited Athenian citizen status to people with an Athenian father and mother. Even if the play was first performed after that date (which is uncertain), and even if we allow that tragedy made such political allusions, the reference would be irrelevant: the issue at stake is Hellenicity, not membership of an individual *polis*.

1264–5 εἴθ’ ὕμιν ἀμφοῖν νοῦς γένοιτο σωφρονεῖν· | τοῦτου γὰρ οὐδὲν σφῶν ἔχω λῶον φράσαι. ‘If only both of you had the inclination to be wise! I have no better advice to offer you than this.’ The chorus turn Agamemnon’s οὐ σωφρονήσεις; (1259) back on him, but include Teucer in the rebuke. Such an intervention, addressed to both speakers, would more naturally come after the second speech. Its placing implies that the chorus can guess the tone of Teucer’s address; and allows the intervention of Odysseus to seem more sudden. According to Ll-J/W (*So.* p. 88), ‘a choral comment at the end of the agon would diminish the force of the second speaker’s obvious triumph’; but is Teucer so clearly the winner (1266–1315n.)? For ὕμιν (thus Schneidewin¹ for

manuscript ὑμῖν) see 216–17n. For γάρ ‘giv[ing] the motive for saying that which has just been said’ see Denniston 60–1.

1266–1315 Teucer returns the focus to Ajax. After a preamble lamenting the lack of χάρις for his achievements (1266–71), he constructs a detailed defence of Ajax’s military prowess, citing two specific incidents: he saved the ships (1272–82) and fought Hector in a duel (1283–9). The sheer length of his sentences and detail of his narrative enliven Teucer’s exposition, and convey indignation: Agamemnon is no match for this warrior. For all his passion, Teucer emphasises his rhetorical purpose of refuting one of his opponent’s assertions (1280–2, in the transition from one account to the other); more generally, he implies that Ajax’s contribution to the Greek cause should guarantee him respect after death (hence the opening reference to χάρις). There has been no previous specific description of this contribution; here it aids the partial rehabilitation of Ajax.

Teucer’s proud boast associating himself with Ajax’s deeds (1288–9) is a justified riposte to Agamemnon’s contempt. But rather than leave it at that, he devotes his next section to answering Agamemnon’s charge against him: his allegedly servile origin (1290–1303). He begins by counter-attacking (1290–8), scorning his opponent’s lineage (‘a stock-in-trade of the rhetorician’: Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 28.2, p. 487). The assault is certainly vigorous, moving from Pelops’ foreign ethnicity, to Atreus’ dubious morality, to the Cretan Aerope’s sexual misconduct; the last, combining both ethnicity and morality, and given three lines instead of two, climactically references Agamemnon’s own mother. He follows this by celebrating his own parents, Telamon and Hesione (1299–1303). Again, this is a convincing rebuttal of Agamemnon’s case, decorated with colourful detail and delivered with élan. (Contrast Teucer’s refutation of Menelaus’ case at 1093–1110, where the constitutional focus required a less vivid, though equally vehement, style; skilfully, he adapts his rhetorical manner depending on the subject in hand.) The audience may wonder, however, whether Teucer should not have risen above the original accusation. By deigning to answer in such detail an irrelevant charge, Teucer allows himself to be dragged down somewhat to Agamemnon’s level.

In the final section (1304–15), which explicitly raises the issue of burial, Teucer makes effective rhetorical use of the tableau formed by Ajax, Eurysaces, and Tecmessa which dominates the stage (1308–9). But he cannot resist a final, futile threat (1313–15), ending with a wildly exaggerated assertion of his own capacity to inflict harm, rather than the merits of Ajax or the need to bury him. As in his speech to Menelaus, the question of divine law, the most obvious buttress to his case, goes unmentioned. Ajax himself comes out well from the speech; but his champion, by effectively allowing Agamemnon to set the

agenda, provides a less effective vindication of his half-brother than he might have done.

1266–7 φεῦ, τοῦ θανόντος ὡς ταχεῖά τις βροτοῖς | χάρις διαρρεῖ καὶ προδοῦσ' ἄλίσκεται 'Alas, how swiftly does gratitude towards a dead man flow away from mortals, and is caught betraying him.' For the thought cf. Eur. fr. 736.5–6 *TrGF* ἢ δ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς χάρις | ἀπόλωλ', ὅταν τις ἐκ δόμων ἀνὴρ θάνῃ, Stes. fr. 245 *PMGF* θανόντος ἀνδρὸς πᾶσα ἰπολιὰ ποτ' ἀνθρώπων χάρις. Despite the singular and article, τοῦ θανόντος is generic, as generalising βροτοῖς indicates: Teucer applies the general statement to Ajax's specific case in 1268–70 (cf. 650–2n.). For adverbial ταχεῖα cf. *OR* 618, Bruhn §8. τις 'combines with adjectives used predicatively, giving a generic instead of a specific sense, and so implying membership of a class' (Moorhouse 159); ignorance of this meaning, coupled with the proximity of βροτοῖς, led to the minority variant τοῖς. J. Wright (1894) xxxii conjectures τοι, a particle appropriate in a general reflection (455–6n.), but perhaps not after exclamatory ὡς.

For χάρις in descriptions of the relationship between the living and the dead see *El.* 356n. For διαρρεῖ see 523–4n. Word order suggests that προδοῦσ' ἄλίσκεται go together (cf. *Ant.* 46 οὐ γὰρ δὴ προδοῦσ' ἄλωσομαι, Eur. *Andr.* 191, Xen. *Cyr.* 5.1.22): χάρις is partly personified, and 'betrays' the dead man by its speedy departure from the world of the living. Pearson (1920) 56 argues for an intransitive sense for the participle ('fail'; cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. προδίδωμι π 3), but ἄλίσκεται is then obscure.

1268–9 εἰ σοῦ γ' ὅδ' ἀνὴρ οὐδ' ἐπὶ σμικρὸν λόγον, | Αἴας, ἔτ' ἴσχει μνηστὶν 'if this man no longer has any remembrance of you, Ajax, not even to the extent of a brief word'. By addressing the dead Ajax by name, Teucer highlights his refusal to make contact with Agamemnon (1093–6n.). σμικρὸν λόγον (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 9 for manuscript –ὦν –ων) gives the idiom found at *El.* 414 ἄλλ' οὐκά τοιδα πλὴν ἐπὶ σμικρὸν φράσαι ('to a small extent'), where the variants σμικρῶν and σμικρῷ indicate that the construction confused scribes there too. The addition of λόγον does not fundamentally change the sense (so rightly Ll-J/W, *So.*). Supporters of –ὦν –ων gather a few weak parallels for ἐπὶ with a modal genitive ('not even in brief words': Jebb). This is pointless when an easy alternative is to hand which scarcely counts as an emendation. σμικρὸν χρόνον (*coni.* Jaeger (1811) 156–7) gives a more explicit connexion with τάχειά τις in 1266. For the corruption cf. *Ant.* 1078 οὐ μακροῦ χρόνου [v.l. λόγου], *OC* 619–20 τὰ νῦν ξυμφωνα δεξιώματα | δόρει διασκεδῶσιν ἐκ σμικροῦ [v.l. μακροῦ] λόγου [v.l. χρόνου]; for ἐπὶ marking extent of time fr. 255.3 *TrGF* ἐπ' ἡμαρ, Hom. *Od.* 12.407 οὐ μάλα πολλὸν ἐπὶ χρόνον, Hes. *Op.* 133, 326, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐπὶ c π 1. But ἔτι probably gives sufficient emphasis to duration; while ἐπὶ σμικρὸν λόγον then raises the equally important question of the extent of Agamemnon's ingratitude.

For εἰ . . . γε with the force ‘seeing that’ see Denniston 142. For ἀνὴρ (Brunck) see 9–10n. For the variant Αἶαν see 89–90n. For ἵσχει μνήστιν see 11–13n., 520n. For memory in this context see 520–21n.

1269–70 οὐ σὺ πολλάκις | τὴν σὴν προτείνων προῦκαμες ψυχὴν δορί· ‘on whose behalf you laboured many times with your spear, risking your own life’. Teucer’s complaint on Ajax’s behalf is modelled on that of Homer’s Achilles (cf. *Il.* 9.322 αἶεν ἐμήν ψυχὴν παραβόλόμενος πολέμιζεν); the wider context in both cases is the absence of gratitude which a warrior receives (*ibid.* 316–17 ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρα τις χάρις ἦεν | μάρνασθαι δῆοισιν ἐπ’ ἀνδράσι νωλεμές αἰεῖ). Cf. also [Eur.] *Rhes.* 182–3 χρή δ’ ἐπ’ ἀξίοις πονεῖν | ψυχὴν προβάλλοντ’ ἐν κύβοισι δαίμονος. For Dindorf’s δόρει (1825 edn) see 515–17n.

1271 ἀλλ’ οἴχεται δὴ πάντα ταῦτ’ ἐρριμμένα. ‘But all these things have been cast away and are lost.’ For emphatic δὴ with a verb see Denniston 214–15. For ῥίπτω ‘reject with contempt’ see *El.* 1018n. There is little to choose between πάντα ταῦτ’ and the minority variant ταῦτα πάντ’.

1272–9 These events do not correspond exactly to the narrative of the *Iliad*. Ajax is the mainstay of the Greeks’ fighting retreat, which lasts from books 11 to 16, as the Trojans aim to fire the ships (cf. 9.241–2, where Odysseus says of Hector στεῦται γὰρ νηῶν ἀποκόψειν ἄκρα κόρυμβα | αὐτάς τ’ ἐμπρήσειν μαλεροῦ πυρός). Twice he prevents a blaze (15.730–1 ἐγχεῖ δ’ αἰεῖ | Τρῶας ἄμυνε νεῶν, ὅς τις φέροι ἀκάματον πῦρ, 15.743–5 ὅς τις δὲ Τρῶων κοίλης ἐπὶ νηυσὶ φέροιτο | σύν πυρὶ κηλείω, χάριν Ἑκτορος ὀτρύναντος, | τὸν δ’ Αἴας οὔτασκε δεδεγμένος ἐγχεῖ μακρῶ), and manages to wound Hector during his onslaught (14.409–18). But in time Hector disables Ajax’s spear, forcing him to retreat, and the Trojans cast fire on the stern of Protesilaus’ ship (16.112–24). The narrator’s address to the Muses emphasises this climactic event; Patroclus then returns to the fighting in Achilles’ armour, and he, not Ajax, drives back the Trojans. Nor does Hector leap over the ditch; he guides the Trojans to cross it in book 12, and crosses it with the assistance of Apollo at 15.343–66. He leaps through the freshly-breached Achaean wall, however, at 12.462–3 ὃ δ’ ἄρ’ ἔσθορε φαίδιμος Ἑκτωρ | νυκτὶ θοῇ ἀτάλαντος ὑπώπτια and 12.438 πρῶτος ἐσήλατο τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν.

By altering the Homeric account, ‘S. is deliberately reworking the *Iliad*’s material for the greater glory of Ajax, in order to facilitate his *post mortem* rehabilitation’ (MD). Davies cites Macleod on *Il.* 24.72–3, who points to the reinvention of details for similar effect in the *Iliad* itself. At 12.438 (cited previous paragraph) Hector is said to have been first to leap over the Achaean wall, but at 16.558 this is credited to Sarpedon. While strictly incorrect (he first broke through the wall: 12.397–9), this magnifies Sarpedon’s achievement and the pathos of his death. We should reject other explanations for the discrepancy:

that S. was following a different source from Homer (Campbell on 1276–8), or ‘wrote from a general recollection of the *Iliad*, without caring whether he reproduced its details’ (Jebb on 1277–8). Nor should we conclude that Teucer is exaggerating: if his claims were false, we would expect a refutation (*El.* 566–76n., 612–33n.).

Ajax’s defence of the ships recurs at Tr. Adesp. fr. 640b.56 *TrGF* (v/2 p. 1133)]κῶς ναυσὶν ἤμυν[εν; Teucer holds back the Trojans as they leap over the ditch at Tr. Adesp. fr. 569 Τεῦκρος δὲ τόξων χρώμενος φειδωλίᾳ | ὑπὲρ τάφρου πηδῶντας ἔστισσε<v> Φρύγας.

1272 ὦ πολλὰ λέξας ἄρτι κἀνόητ’ ἔπη ‘You who just now spoke so many foolish words’ (Lloyd-Jones). Teucer’s address to Agamemnon is intensified through delay (cf. *OC* 1354, Oedipus to Polynices), and perhaps by the participle with ὦ replacing a vocative (845–9n.). κἀνόητ’ becomes κἀνόνητ’ in some manuscripts, but the direct attack on Agamemnon’s intelligence better suits the belligerent tone; for the reverse corruption see 758–61n.

1273–6 οὐ μνημονεύεις οὐκέτ’ οὐδέν, ἥνικά | ἐρκέων ποθ’ ὕμᾱς ἐντός ἐγκεκλημένους, | ἤδη τὸ μηδὲν ὄντας ἐν τροπῇ δορός, | ἐρρύσατ’ ἐλθὼν μοῦνος ‘Do you no longer remember the time when, as you were cooped up inside the walls, by now undone in the turning of battle, he came and rescued you, on his own’. ἐντός (Xr; and a gloss in thirteenth-century manuscripts; *coni.* Markland (pre-1776)) is superior to the dominant manuscript reading οὔτος for two reasons. (i) The genitive is hard to construe. Commentators since Abresch (1743) 1 175 have compared Eur. *Phoen.* 450–1 ὑπόσπονδον μολεῖν | τόνδ’ εἰσεδέξω τειχεῶν πείσασά με, but Diggle (1989) 200 = (1994) 345–6 and Kovacs rightly adopt Wecklein’s deletion. The genitive of place, on the other hand, is weakly attested in S. (*El.* 78n, Moorhouse 59, S–D II 112), and would be an oddly indirect way of conveying the crucial idea ‘within’. (ii) With ἐντός the word order is expressive: two full lines of accusatives build up the tension before Ajax’s climactic intervention. οὔτος, on the other hand, stands isolated, weakly anticipating its distant predicate. Corruption from ΕΝΤΟΣ to ΟΥΤΟΣ would be assisted by word-initial ΟΥ three times in the preceding line. (Xr’s reading probably shows the intrusion of the gloss (28n.); the gloss itself is conceivably a preservation (146n.), but much more probably has its origin with a glossator, not Sophocles. We should treat the reading as a conjecture without manuscript authority, which nevertheless happens to be right.)

For μνημονεύεις... ἥνικά cf. 1283, Eur. *Hec.* 110, 239, Hom. *Il.* 15.18 ἧ οὐ μέμνη’ ὅτε..., Ar. *Av.* 1054, Headlam’s edition of Herodas, p. 145 n. 1, K–G II 368–9. ἐγκεκλημένους for transmitted –ειμένους or –εισμένους is owed to Elmsley (1813a) 212; for the correct orthography see A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 39–40. For τὸ μηδὲν ὄντας cf. *Tr.* 1107–8 κἄν τὸ μηδὲν ὦ, | κἄν μηδὲν ἔρπω (Heracles on his physical incapacity), Moorhouse (1965) 36; contrast 766–9n.

(generic), 1231n. The stress on motion in ἐλθών (*Ajax came and rescued them*) anticipates Teucer's attack on Agamemnon for doing the opposite (1280–1); we should reject ἐχθρῶν (*coni. Reiske (1753) 9*). μοῦνος makes the action still more praiseworthy (cf. 1384, *El.* 531n.).

1276–9 ἀμφὶ μὲν νεῶν | ἄκροισιν ἤδη ναυτικοῖς <θ'> ἐδωλίοις | πυρὸς φλέγοντος, εἰς δὲ ναυτικά σκάφη | πηδῶντος ἄρδην Ἑκτορος τάφρων ὕπερ; 'as the fire already blazed at the top of the ships and the naval quarter-decks, and as Hector leapt high over the ditch towards the ships' hulls.' ἄκρα ναῶν and ναυτικά ἐδωλία both denote the stern decks, where fire lands in the *Iliad* (16.124 τὴν μὲν πρυμνὴν πῦρ ἄμφεπεν, where note the preverb; cf. 15.704, 716–18). For ἄκρος in a naval context Garvie compares Hom. *Od.* 8.111 Ἀκρόνεως (a Phaeacian name) and Alcaeus fr. 34.9 Voigt εὐσδ[ύγ]ων θρώσκοντ[ε]ς. ἄκρος ναῶν (of the manifestation of the Dioscuri as St Elmo's fire, and so denoting the mast-top). For ἐδωλία of the stern decks (literally 'seating', referring to the seat of the helmsman: thus Morrison and Williams (1968) 132) cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1571 Ἑλένη καθέζετ' ἐν μέσοις ἐδωλίοις, the location later specified by her shouting πρύμνηθεν (1602–3), and Hdt. 1.24.4–5, where Arion takes his stand ἐν τοῖσι ἐδωλίοισι, before the sailors retreat ἐκ τῆς πρύμνης ἐς μέσην νέα, leaving him alone at the stern. The term also occurs at Eur. *Cycl.* 238–9 συνδήσαντες ἐς θαδῶλια | τῆς ναὸς ἐμβαλόντες, and is defined in the *Suda* as τὰ σανιδώματα τῶν πλοίων. κυρίως, ἐφ' ὧν οἱ ἐρέται καθέζονται (ε 255 = II 206.10–11 Adler). For the firing of a ship cf. also Virg. *Aen.* 5.662 *furit immissis Volcanus habenis | transtra per et remos*.

θ' (*coni. Bothe*¹) eases the syntax; without it, ἐδωλίοις would be qualified by both νεῶν and ναυτικοῖς, an improbable pleonasm not paralleled by *Phil.* 540 νεὼς σῆς ναυβάτης, Eur. *IA* [266–7] ναυβάτας | ναῶν, *Suppl.* 590 νεὼς [λεὼς Diggle (1981c) = (1994) 219] τε ναύτης, *IT* 1386 ναῦται νεὼς [ναύτης λεὼς F. Schmidt]. Even after we adopt θ', it remains possible that ναυτικοῖς is the result of corruption caused by ναυτικά in 1278; possible replacements are ναυτίλοις (Wecklein *teste* Jebb, for which cf. *Phil.* 220, Aesch. *Ag.* 1442), ναυτίλων (Dawe, *STS* 1 170), and πευκίνιοις (Bergk (1849) iii).

ἄρδην is originally tragic vocabulary (< ἀείρω, 'lift'), which expands into prose and comedy as a general intensifier (see A/O on Ar. *Thesm.* 274).

1280–1 τίς ταῦτ' ἀπέϊρξεν; οὐχ ὅδ' ἦν ὁ δρῶν τάδε, | ὃν οὐδαμοῦ φῆς, οὗ σὺ μή, βῆναι ποδῖ; 'Who prevented these things? Wasn't it this man who did them, who you say occupied no position that you did not?' Teucer refers to Agamemnon's claim at 1236–7. For the 'timeless' present participle δρῶν see 1248–9n. For the vocalism and accent of φῆς see 791n. οὗ σὺ μή, βῆναι for transmitted οὐδὲ συμβῆναι is the palmary conjecture of Krauss (1850) 50. The paradoxos gives obscure Greek: there are no parallels for the postulated senses 'stand alongside' Agamemnon or 'meet with' the Trojans

in battle. Even if we allow them, we make Teucer attribute an assertion to Agamemnon which he never made; Campbell claims that ‘Teucer speaks with the exaggeration of anger’, but elsewhere he rebuts Agamemnon’s accusations with furious precision (e.g. 1288–9n.). The brevity of the relative clause lent itself to misreading and consequent corruption. For ποδί with βαινῶ and related verbs cf. Eur. *Hec.* 1263, *El.* 1288–9, V. Schmidt (1975) 292–3; also (ποσὶ) Hom. *Il.* 5.745 = 8.389, *Hom. Hym.* 2.317, Stes. fr. S17.8–9 *PMGF*, Bacchyl. 18.16–17, Pind. *N.* 1.50.

1282 ἄρ’ ὕμιν οὗτος ταῦτ’ ἔδρασεν ἔνδικα; ‘Did this man do these things justly, in your opinion?’ For ἄρ’ see 977–8n., for ὕμιν, 216–17n. (accent, restored by Schaefer for manuscript ὕμιν) and 437–40n. (dative of judgment). Dawe prints ἄμ’ . . . ἡ διχα ‘Did he do this together with you, or separately?’ (*coni.* Musgrave and Reiske (1753) 9 respectively); but the expression is awkward, and ἔνδικα picks up Agamemnon’s claim that Ajax’s party is acting illegitimately (1248).

1283–7 χῶτ’ αὔθις αὐτὸς Ἑκτορος μόνος μόνου, | λαχὼν τε κάκελευστος, ἦλθεν ἀντίος, | οὐ δραπέτην τὸν κλῆρον ἐς μέσον καθεῖς, | ὕγρᾶς ἀρούρας βῶλον, ἀλλ’ ὃς εὐλόφου | κυνῆς ἔμελλε πρῶτος ἄλμα κουφιεῖν; ‘And when another time he himself went against Hector, man against man, chosen by lot and not under orders – since the token that he cast in was no runaway, a clod of wet earth, but such as would be first to leap lightly from the crested helmet?’ Teucer refers to the warriors’ single combat narrated in Hom. *Il.* 7.38–312. After Hector’s challenge, Menelaus’ abortive acceptance, and Nestor’s stinging rebuke, seven chiefs volunteer to face him; they cast lots, and Ajax is selected (7.170–205).

Since the competitors scratch an identifying mark onto the lots (175, 187) they are presumably pieces of pottery, wood, or the like. A clod of earth, Teucer implies, would be denser and thus not likely to exit the helmet first. Clods also feature as lots in the division of the Peloponnese among Cresphontes, Temenus, and the heirs of Aristodemus. The owner of the last lot to remain in the urn was to obtain Messenia; desiring that prize, Cresphontes put in some earth as his token, which, since the urn was full of water, dissolved, leaving him ruler of that land. Cf. Euripides’ *Temenidae* or *Temenus* test. i–ii *TrGF*, fr. 727e, perhaps Enn. *Cresphontes* 137 Jocelyn (see J.’s n., p. 271), Plaut. *Cas.* 398–9 *utinam tua quidem <ista>, sicut Herculei praedicant | quondam prognatis, in sortiēdo sors deliquerit* (possibly imitating a scene from Diphilus’ *Kleroumenoi*, but see Lowe (2003) 178–9), Apollod. 2.8.4, Paus. 4.3.5, Luraghi (2008) 46–67. Eustathius cites our passage and the Cresphontes story in the context of a discussion of anachronism in tragedy (361.26–9 = 1568.4–7 Van der Valk), since ‘Cresphontes was a great-great-grandson of Heracles and therefore Ajax’s junior by three generations’ (Easterling (1985) 9). But S. is free to use the motif

in this myth without implying that Teucer is thinking of the Cresphontes story; moreover, his concern is with density, not dissolution.

The sentence depends on οὐ μνημονεύεις (1273). αὖθις means ‘in the next place’, referring to a new stage in a narrative (cf. Mastronarde on Eur. *Phoen.* 1600). For the ‘emphatic redundancy’ in αὐτός . . . μόνος see M. on *ibid.* 1229–30; αὐτός ‘the same man’ (Xs, *coni.* Wolff) is possible. For the iteration μόνος μόνου see 466–8n. For μόνος predicated of Ajax see 29–31n. Both variants ἦλθεν ἀντίος and ἦλθ’ ἐναντίος have equal authority (177–8n.). For ἀντίος cf. *Tr.* 785 κοῦδεις ἐτόλμα τάνδρὸς ἀντίον μολεῖν, *Tr.* Adesp. fr. 145c *TrGF* ἀντίον δορὸς ὀρνύμενος Ἀχιλλέως, Eur. *Or.* 1479 ἔναντα δ’ ἦλθεν Πυλάδας ἀλίαςτος, Hom. *Il.* 21.150 ἀντίος ἐλθεῖν; by contrast, ἐναντίος with the genitive means ‘opposite’, not ‘against’ (cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.497 ἐναντίοι ἔσταν Ἀχαιῶν).

ἐκὼν (*coni.* Reiske (1753) 10) in place of λαχὼν gives a specious opposition with ἀκέλευστος: but ἄρχων implies ἐκὼν, since lots were drawn only for those who had volunteered’ (Jebb). In Homer too the warriors cast their lots into a κυνέη (7.176, 182, 187), a standard term for helmet (Borchhardt (1972) 7) attested for S. in P.Oxy. 4807 col. ii.6–7 (Mülke (2007) 21) κυναῖ . . . | φοινεικοβαφεῖς σεί[ο]νσι λό[φους]. For the ablative genitive εὐλόφου | κυνῆς see *El.* 324n. Ajax’s lot in Homer also ‘leaps’ from the helmet (7.182 ἐκ δ’ ἔθορε κλῆρος κυνέης). ἄλμα κουφιεῖν is equivalent to ἄλμα κοῦφον ἀλεῖσθαι: cf. Eur. *El.* 861 πῆδημα κουφίζουσα, *Suppl.* 1047 δύστηνον αἰώρημα κουφίζω with Collard, Archias *A.P.* 7.214.4 = 3727 *GP* ὕγρον ἀναρρίψεις ἄλμα, Long (1968) 93–4.

1288–9 ὅδ’ ἦν ὁ πράσσων ταῦτα, σὺν δ’ ἐγὼ παρών, | ὁ δοῦλος, οὐκ τῆς βαρβάρου μητρὸς γεγώς. ‘This was the man who did these things, and with him I was there, the slave, the man born from a barbarian mother.’ Teucer fights alongside his brother in the *Iliad* at e.g. 15.436–83. For the ‘timeless’ present participle πράσσων see 1248–9n. παρών has the nuance ‘present to play my part’ (741–2n.). οὐκ τῆς βαρβάρου μητρὸς γεγώς flings Agamemnon’s words from 1228 back in his face; the definite article indicates the quotation (726–7n.) and the contemptuous tone (1120n.).

1290 δύστηνε, ποῖ βλέπων ποτ’ αὐτὰ καὶ θροεῖς; ‘You wretch, where are you looking when you say that?’ Teucer implies that Agamemnon should be ashamed to look him in the eye (462–3n.) as he makes such accusations. For δύστηνος in reproach see 618–620/1n. For the minority variant ποῦ see 1236–7n. αὐτὰ denotes the implied sentence βαρβάρου μητρὸς γεγώς εἶ (thus Dawe, *STS* 1 171, comparing *OR* 132 ἀλλ’ ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς αὖθις αὐτ’ ἐγὼ φανῶ, which picks up τάφανῃ from the previous line). The variant ποτ’ αὐτός gives the wrong emphasis; Reiske (1753) 10 tries σὺ ταῦτα, but ποτέ adds to the exasperation. Delayed καὶ immediately before the verb adds force to the

question: cf. *OR* 1129 ποῖον ἄνδρα καὶ λέγεις; *Tr.* 314 τί δ' ἄν με καὶ κρίνεις; Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 224, Denniston 315–16.

1291–2 οὐκ οἶσθα σοῦ πατρός μὲν δς προῦφν πατήρ | τάρχαϊον ὄντα Πέλοπα βάρβαρον Φρύγα; ‘Don’t you know your father’s father, Pelops, was originally a barbarous Phrygian?’ For the attack on the foreign background of the Atreids cf. Eur. *Li* [952–3] with Hall (1989) 176–7. At Hom. *Il.* 2.105 Pelops gives a sceptre, previously owned by Hephaestus, Zeus, and Hermes, to Atreus; Atreus bequeaths it to Thyestes, and he to Agamemnon (106–7). This is consistent with his being Atreus’ father. Aeschylus’ Orestes calls his family the Πελοπίδαι (*Cho.* 503; on *Ag.* [1600] see Finglass (2006c) 263–4); Herodotus (7.159) refers to ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων. The earliest text to state explicitly that Pelops was father of Atreus and Thyestes (by Hippodameia) is Hellenistic fr. 157 *EGM* (cf. Thuc. 1.9.2). Pelops himself has the epithet Τανταλίδης (*Tyrt.* 12.7 *IEG*, *Cypria* fr. 16.4 *GEF*, Simon. fr. 11.36 *IEG*); his sister was Niobe (daughter of Tantalus in Aeschylus’ *Niobe*; cf. Pher. Ath. fr. 38 *EGM*, S. *Ant.* 823–825/6).

The first association of Pelops’ family with Asia Minor is in the *Iliad*, where Niobe is petrified ἐν Σιπύλῳ (24.615, defended by Richardson against ancient suspicions), a place which later texts specify as the home of Tantalus and his family (Pind. *O.* 1.38, Xanthus of Lydia *FGHist* 765 F 20c, Pher. Ath. fr. 38 *EGM*, Sakellariou (1958) 226 n. 1), and today identified with Spil Dağı, near Manisa (~ Magnesia), in ancient Lydia (see André-Salvini and Salvini (1996) on the rock formation there associated with Niobe). This identification is ancient, since Hellenistic refers to the city of Μαγνησία ἐπὶ Σιπύλῳ (fr. 191 *EGM*); other ancient texts are less specific, variously locating Sipylus in the land of Ida (Aesch. fr. 163 *TrGF*), Phrygia (Hellan. fr. 76 *EGM* – if this is H.’s word – and S. *Ant.* 823–825/6), or somewhere in Lydia or Ionia (Dem. Phyl. fr. 1 *EGM*). In Aesch. fr. 158 Tantalus’ realm is more expansive: twelve days’ journey in extent, it contains several named places, all (with the possible exception of ‘the Bercyntian land’) in or around the Troad. See further West (1985) 158.

This confusion is a consequence of the vague terminology denoting regions of Asia Minor. So while Pelops is Λύδιος in Pindar (*O.* 1.24, 9.9), he is also associated with Phrygia, as in our passage, even though Phrygia proper, centred around Gordium, was to the east of Lydia. Hecataeus fr. 119 *EGM* (as cited by Strabo) says that Pelops led his people from Phrygia to settle what is now called the Peloponnese; Bacchyl. 8.31 refers to ‘Phrygian Pelops’, as does Herodotus’ Xerxes (7.11.4, 7.8γ.1); Telestes fr. 810.1–3 *PMG* attributes the introduction of the Φρύγιος νόμος of the Mother to the συνοπαδοὶ Πέλοπος. (Lydia and Phrygia seem interchangeable at Eur. *Alc.* 675, Ar. *Az.* 1244.) Thucydides is vaguer, reporting that Pelops arrived ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας (1.9.2).

The literary associations of Phrygia with barbarity and weakness (cf. Eur. *Or.* 1351–2, 1447, 1483–8b, 1528, Men. *Asp.* 241–3, Hall (1989) 273 Index s.v. ‘Phrygia, Phrygians: characterization as barbarians’, Headlam on Herodas 2.37) were reinforced by the large numbers of Phrygian slaves in Athens. The same attack on Peloponnesians (and Thebans) for their barbarian origin is attested in fourth-century works by Athenians (who believed themselves autochthonous): Hall (1989) 168 cites Isocr. 10.68, 12.80, Pl. *Men.* 245cd. The counterpart to Teucer’s insult is Xerxes’ reference to Πέλοψ ὁ Φρύξ, ἐὼν πατέρων τῶν ἐμῶν δοῦλος (Hdt. 7.11.4), as a precedent for successive invasions of Greece from the East. The iconography of Pelops incorporates oriental aspects from the middle of the fifth century (see Miller (2005) 72).

Pelops was also father of Alcathus/Alcathous ([Theogn.] 774, by a Megarian poet writing shortly after 480 (West (1974) 65), Dieuchidas *FGHHist* 485 f 10 = fr. 8 Piccirilli), who was father of Eriboea/Periboea (Xen. *Cyn.* 1.9, Philostephanus of Cyrene fr. 35 *FHG*, III 33 = ΣD Hom. *Il.* 16.14 Van Thiel), mother of Ajax (567–70n.); Ajax is thus the great-grandson of Pelops, and Agamemnon’s first cousin once removed. But Ajax’s maternal ancestry is not traced beyond Eriboea in this play, and so the audience will not charge Teucer with inconsistency. (Contrast Eur. *Hcl.* 207–13 and *Suppl.* 263–4, where suppliants urge on potential benefactors their shared descent from Pelops.)

τάρχαϊον for transmitted ἀρχαῖον is owed to Campbell (for the crasis error see 39n.). ‘The poet obviously meant to say not “was an ancient Phrygian” [cf. Gow and Page on Call. *A.P.* 11.362.1 = 1311 *HE* ὥρχαῖος Ὀρέστης, citing Theocr. 11.8 ὥρχαῖος Πολύφαμος, Arat. 99, Nic. *Th.* 487, Schneider on Call. *Hym.* 4.308], but “was originally a Phrygian” [cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 326, Hdt. 1.56.2, Thuc. 2.99.3, Xen. *An.* 1.1.6, Pl. *Ion* 541d], and without this slight alteration the words will not bear what is the obvious meaning’ (LI-J/W, *ST*). It would also be strange for five consecutive accusatives in the same line to have the same referent.

1293–4 Ἀτρεά δ’, ὃς αὖ σ’ ἔσπειρε, δυσσεβέστατον | προθέντ’ ἀδελφῶ δείπνον οἰκέων τέκνων; ‘And that Atreus, who begot you, presented to his own brother a most impious meal of his own children?’ Agamemnon’s father in Homer is Atreus (*Il.* 1.7 etc.). The nominative appears only at 2.106; Homer does not mention Agamemnon’s mother. The Thyestean banquet is first attested in literature at Aesch. *Ag.* 1217–22, 1590–1602; cf. Eur. *Or.* 814, 1008. There is no certain depiction in art before the fourth century (see Pipili (1997)); March (2000) 133–4 suggests that it appears on an Attic red-figure column-krater from c. 470–460 (Rome, Villa Giulia 3579, *ARV*² 514.3), but the traditional identification of that vase as a portrayal of the myth of Tereus is preferable. S. wrote up to three *Thyestes* plays (*TrGF* IV 239–40), as well as an *Atreus* (see Pearson’s edition of the fragments, 191–3, 185–7); there were *Thyestes*

plays by Euripides (see the Loeb by Collard and Cropp, 1428–31) and minor tragedians (*TrGF* IV 240). On these see further Collard (2009) 311–15. The same story pattern is found in Sophocles' *Tereus* and the account of Harpagus and Astyages in Hdt. 1.119; cf. West (2007) 442–3. For σπείρω 'beget' see Harder on Eur. fr. 228a.16 *TrGF* (p. 200).

Before Elmsley (1812) 455, editors placed a comma after δυσσεβέστατον, but the adjective is more forceful with the archetypally evil banquet (cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 289 βοράν . . . δυσσεβῆ, 31, 693).

1295–7 αὐτὸς δὲ μητρὸς ἐξέφυς Κρήσσης, ἐφ' ἣ | λαβὼν ἑπακτὸν ἄνδρ' ὁ φιλύσας πατήρ | ἐφῆκεν ἔλλοις ἰχθύσιν διαφθοράν. 'And you yourself were born from a Cretan mother, whom her father, when he found a paramour with her, consigned to the sea to be a prey for fishes.' In [Hes.] fr. 195 M–W an unidentified man marries κολ[λίσφυ]ρον Ἡρόπ[ειαν] and fathers three children by her, [. . .]bius, Menelaus, and Agamemnon. According to testimonia (= fr. 194), Hesiod made Pleisthenes father of Agamemnon, which would make him husband of Aerope; but one of these testimonia, Tzetzes, also states that Pleisthenes was the son of Aerope by Atreus. (See Kakridis (1978), (1981), West (1985) 111 with n. 188 and, for other early references to Pleisthenes, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1569.) In tragedy Aerope is mother of Agamemnon and Menelaus by Atreus (Eur. *Hel.* 390–2, *Or.* 16–18). Euripides' *Cressae* (a problematic play dating to 438: see Collard (2005b) 52–7 and the Loeb by Collard and Cropp, 1516–19) may have had Pleisthenes as the father (test. iiia, iiic *TrGF*), but Atreus also seems to have had a part (test. v, fr. 465).

Aerope was daughter of Catreus, king of Crete (Eur. *Cressae* test. iiic, v). Our passage probably constitutes the earliest reference to her premarital sexual misconduct. According to Euripides' play (test. iiia), her father discovered that she had been seduced by a servant and handed her over to Nauplius to be drowned; he did not carry out the command (cf. perhaps fr. 466), and betrothed her to Pleisthenes. An account in Apollodorus (3.2.1–2) states that Catreus handed over both Aerope and her sister Clymene (the latter may have appeared in Euripides: see Collard and Cropp on fr. 466) to Nauplius, because of an oracle that he was going to be killed by one of his children.

Aerope subsequently commits adultery with Thyestes (Aesch. *Ag.* 1191–3, Eur. *El.* 720–3, *Or.* 1009–10). In Euripides' *Electra* the adultery is connected with Thyestes' theft of a golden lamb, an element of the myth attested in the *Alcmeonis* (fr. 6 *GEF*, perhaps sixth or early fifth century, according to West's edition, p. 11; also Pher. Ath. fr. 133 *EGM*, Eur. *IT* 195–7, 811–13, *Or.* 812–13, 998–9). The adultery might have featured there too: it would suit the presumed subject of that poem, the punishment of the adulterous Eriphyle, herself responsible for the ill-fated transfer of a golden object. Perhaps S. puts

the earlier liaison in Teucer's mouth because it means that Agamemnon was born to an already tainted mother.

Aeschylus' *Cressae* (fr. 116–20 *TrGF*) appears to have dealt with a different myth (see Sommerstein's Loeb, III 122–3). The contents of plays called *Aerope* by Agathon (*TrGF* 39 F 1) and Carcinus II (70 F 1) are unknown. *Aerope* may also have featured in the dramas mentioned in 1293–4n. Her story does not appear in art.

Emphatic Κρήσσης suggests that *Aerope's* Cretan ethnicity is itself part of Teucer's assault (thus Armstrong (2006) 109), as is Pelops's Phrygian ancestry at 1291–2. Two possible reasons suggest themselves. (i) Crete may have been felt to be, if not unGreek, nevertheless out of the Greek mainstream. Cf. Hdt. 7.169–71, as well as the minimal participation of Cretans in the Peloponnesian War; in epic Crete was a diverse culture of Greeks and non-Greeks (Hom. *Od.* 19.172–7). (ii) Cretan women, at least in mythology, had a colourful reputation (cf. Armstrong (2006) 110) thanks to Pasiphae, Phaedra, and *Aerope* herself: cf. Ar. *Ran.* 849–50 (Aeschylus to Euripides) ὦ Κρητικὰς μὲν συλλέγων μονωδίας, | γάμους δ' ἀνοσίους εἰσφέρων εἰς τὴν τέχνην. Against this view, Hall (1989) 170 argues that 'Teucer is here interested in the history of female sex offenders in the Cretan royal family, not in their ethnicity'; but her alternatives are not mutually exclusive.

The minority variant αὔθις (for αὐτός) may have arisen under the influence of αὔθις in 1283 (so Dawe, *STS* I 171). Both λαμβάνω and ἐπὶ are idiomatic for the discovery of an adulterer *in flagrante delicto*: cf. Lys. 1.30 ἐπὶ δάμαρτι τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μοιχὸν λαβών, [Dem.] 59.65 λαμβάνει μοιχὸν ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ τῇ Νεαίρας ταυτησί with Kapparis, Blaydes' *ad loc.*, Kapparis (1995) 105–6. Their use emphasises the gross physical discovery of her shame.

ἐπάγω of importing an illicit lover recurs at *Tr.* 378 οὐπάγων (Deianira, on Heracles, conveyer of Iole), Aesch. *Ag.* 1446–7 ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπήγαγεν | εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς (Clytemnestra, on Agamemnon and Cassandra; cf. Sommerstein (2002b) 157), West (1990) 146. For the corruption of φιτύσας (Zr. *coni.* Pierson (pre-1759) 197 recto) to φυτεύσας in most manuscripts see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 313. The participle stresses the paradox that *Aerope's* immorality drove even her father to punish her (cf. *El.* 1412n., adding L. Parker on Eur. *Alc.* 1137–8, West (2007) 87). Hence we should reject the conjectures σ' Ἀτρεὺς (Hermann³, claiming that πατήρ is owed to a grammarian following Euripides' *Cressae*) and σ' ἄνθρωπος (Wolff (1843) 248–9). Collard (2005b) 52 takes the paradox to refer to Agamemnon's father, Atreus, but the traditional view is easier both on the Greek and the myth (*Aerope's* adultery while married to Atreus is with Thyestes, not an unnamed lover).

For Teucer's description of the punishment cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 583 ποντίοις δάκεσι δὸς βοράν, Hom. *Il.* 21.122–3 (Achilles' taunts to Lycaon) ἔνταυθοὶ νῦν κείσο μετ' ἰχθύσιν, οἳ σ' ὠτειλήν | αἶμ' ἀπολιγμήσονται ἀκηδέες, and

Vedius Pollio, who fed condemned slaves to lampreys (Plin. *HN* 9.39, Sen. *Clem.* 1.18.2). For abstract διαφθοράν predicated of Aerope cf. Eur. *Her.* 458–9 ἐτέκομεν ὑμᾶς, πολεμίους δ' ἔθρεψάμην | ὕβρισμα καπρίχαρμα καὶ διαφθοράν, S. *OR* 1246–8 μνήμην παλαιῶν σπερμάτων ἔχουσ', ὕφ' ὧν | θάνοι μὲν αὐτός, τὴν δὲ τίκτουςαν λίποι | τοῖς οἷσιν αὐτοῦ δύστεκνον παιδουργίαν, *Ant.* 533 (Creon, of Antigone and Ismene) δὴ' ἅτα κάπαναστάσεις θρόνων (with ἅτα in an active sense: cf. *OC* 531b), Long (1968) 120 n. 26, 122.

The fishes are dumb (cf. fr. 762.1 *TrGF* χορὸς . . . ἀναύδων ἰχθύων, fr. 1072, Aesch. *Pers.* 577–8) because Aerope's fate will be unknown (cf. Collard (2005b) 52 and the Loeb by *id.* and Cropp, 1 521 n. 1): she is to be wiped out, forgotten. The obscure ἑλλός qualifies fish at *Titanomachy* fr. 14.1 *GEF* ἰχθύες ἑλλοί (cited by Athenaeus 277d as S.'s source); cf. ἑλλοψ [Hes.] *Scut.* 212 ἑλλοπας ἰχθύς and ἑλλοπος at Emped. 31 B 117.2 D–K (1 359.2). Hesych. ε 2167 (11 70 Latte) defines ἑλλόν as ἀγαθόν· γλαυκόν· χαροπόν· ἐνθαλάττιον· ταχύ· ἄφωνον· ὕγρον· ἑλαφον· νεογνόν, and ἑλλοπες (ε 2168) as ἑλλείποντες τῆς ὀπός, τουτέστιν ἄφθογγοι, ἄφωνοι. καὶ δασεῖς· καὶ τραχεῖς· καὶ ποικίλοι. The most plausible derivation of ἑλλοπος is from ἐν–λοπος (< λοπός 'scale'), with ἑλλοψ a secondary formation based on animal names in –οψ, after which ἑλλός was created on the analogy of αἰθός/αἰθοψ (thus *DELG* 341). But 'dumb' was how pseudo-Theocritus understood ἑλλοψ at *Syrinx* 18 ἑλλοπι κούρᾳ, referring to Echo; and since two other adjectives are applied to fish in S. with this meaning (one of them, μυνδός at fr. 1072 *TrGF*, another obscure word), we may guess that this was a favourite designation of his for them and so applies here, especially as it gives a significantly meaningful phrase where e.g. 'scaly' would not.

1298 τοιοῦτος ὧν τοιῷδ' ὀνειδίζεις σποράν; 'Does such a man as you insult the lineage of a man like me?' Juxtaposition of τοιοῦτος ὧν and τοιῷδ' stresses the contrast and marks a transition to Teucer's account of his own family; cf. Ar. *Ach.* 577a οὗτος σύ, τολμᾶς πτωχὸς ὧν λέγειν τάδε; MD compares C. Gracchus, fr. 65a Malcovati *tu matri meae maledicas, quae me peperit?* for 'Teucer's rhetorically effective anger at Agamemnon's attack on his parentage.

1299–1302 ὃς ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν εἰμι Τελαμῶνος γεγώς, | ὅστις στρατοῦ τὰ πρῶτ' ἀριστεύσας ἐμήν | ἴσχει ξύνευνον μητέρ', ἣ φύσει μὲν ἦν | βασιλεια, Λαομέδοντος: 'I am the son of my father Telamon, who displayed the highest valour among the army and took my mother as his spouse, who was by birth a princess, the daughter of Laomedon.' For Hesione, and Telamon's valour in winning her, see 434–6n., 1012–16n. For the bare genitive Λαομέδοντος denoting paternity see 172–5n.

1302–3 ἔκκριτον δὲ νιν | δῶρημ' ἐκείνῳ ᾧκεν Ἀλκμήνης γόνος. 'The offspring of Alcmena gave her as a choice gift to him.' This recalls the Homeric

practice of giving a γέρας, sometimes a female prisoner (such as Achilles' Briseis), as a particular tribute to a warrior: cf. *Il.* 2.226–8 (Thersites to Achilles) πολλοὶ δὲ γυναικες | εἷσιν ἐνὶ κλισίῃς ἐξάιρετοι, ἅς τοι Ἀχαιοὶ | πρωτίστῳ δίδομεν, εὖτ' ἂν πτολίεθρον ἔλωμεν, Aesch. *Ag.* 954–5 (Agamemnon on Cassandra) αὐτῇ δέ, πολλῶν χρημάτων ἐξάιρετον | ἄνθος, στρατοῦ δώρημ' ἐμοὶ ξυνέσπετο, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐξαιρέτος II 1.

δώρημ' ἐκείνῳ for manuscript δώρημα κείνῳ is owed to Brunck. In the seven plays there are thirty-two places in this part of the trimeter where either ἐκείνος or κείνος is possible because the previous word ends in an elidable vowel. According to the manuscript reports in Dawe's edition and *STS* II, ἐκείνος is by far the dominant reading in this position. κείνος is weakly attested in five places (*Aj.* 798, 1108, *El.* 427, *OR* 959, *Phil.* 268); it is the sole reading only here and at *Phil.* 376. This suggests that it is best to read ἐκείνος throughout; when he can, S. uses the normal Attic form. (The same does not hold for all places in the trimeter: see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 319–21.) ὄωκεν (J, *coni.* B. Heath (1762) 12) for manuscript δώκεν restores the augment. Instead of γόνος a few manuscripts have τόκος; for the error cf. 784–5n.

1304–7 ἄρ' ὦδ' ἄριστεὺς ἐξ ἄριστεῶν δυοῖν | βλαστῶν ἂν αἰσχύνοιμι τοὺς πρὸς αἵματος, | οὐς νῦν σὺ τοιοῖσδ' ἐν πόνοισι κειμένους | ὠθεῖς ἀθάπτους, οὐδ' ἐπαισχύνῃ λέγων; 'Should I, a noble thus born from two nobles, bring shame on my kinsman, laid low amid such misfortunes, whom you are casting out unburied, and are not ashamed to say it?' ἄριστεὺς (*coni.* Porson¹ on Eur. *Med.* 5) for transmitted ἄριστος yields polyptoton idiomatic in expressions of biological descent (556–7n.), and perhaps pointedly reversing the common rhetorical insult δοῦλος καὶ ἐκ δούλων (cf. Lys. 13.18, Kamen (2009) 51–2 with n. 44). The same corruption (encouraged by the relative rarity of ἄριστεὺς) occurs at *Phil.* 997 (where one manuscript preserves the truth), Eur. *Alc.* 921, and *Med.* 5 (cf. also *El.* 22), as advocated in detail by Parker on the *Alcesteis* passage; Blomfield suggests it at Aesch. *Pers.* 306. The minority variant ἄριστεῶν would give a plural noun after δυοῖν; although possible after δύο (cf. 237, Moorhouse 2–3), it is unlikely after δυοῖν with its conspicuously dual termination (see Cuny (1906) 151–2, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1384, and West's apparatus there).

Teucer uses the plural even though he means Ajax alone; cf. *Tr.* 1236–7, Moorhouse 6–7. The presence of Tecmessa and Eurysaces near the body, even though they are not in need of burial, may illogically assist the idiom. λέγων returns to Teucer's question 'How can you say such things?' (cf. 1272, 1290); we lose this effect by reading ὕγγελῶν (*coni.* Van Eldik (1764) 5–6 = Schaefer (1802) 181), γελῶν (*coni.* Burges on Aesch. *Eum.* 710, positing the same uncial transposition as in J at 327), or βλέπων (*coni.* Schneidewin (1849) 475, comparing *Phil.* 929–30).

1308–9 εὖ νυν τόδ' ἴσθι, τοῦτον εἰ βαλεῖτέ που, | βαλεῖτε χήμας τρεῖς ὁμοῦ συγκαίμενους. 'So be assured of this, if you cast out this man anywhere, you will also cast out us three who lie here with him.' Teucer, Eurysaces, and Tecmessa are prepared to die in defence of Ajax's body and have their corpses similarly dishonoured; failure to understand proleptic συγκαίμενους probably led to the minority variant συνεμπόρους (Dawe, *STS* 1171). For minatory εὖ νυν τόδ' ἴσθι see *El.* 605n. νυν (Turnebus) for manuscript νῦν restores the required inferential sense. βαλεῖτε rather than e.g. ἔδτε κείσθαι frames the action in especially opprobrious terms (cf. 1333). Brunck (II/2 p. 175) suggests changing που τοῖ ποι, but see 1236–7n. For the 'idiomatic pleonasm, ὁμοῦ coupled with a συν-compound' see Diggle (1981a) 39.

1310–12 ἐπεὶ καλόν μοι τοῦδ' ὑπερπονόμενῳ | θανεῖν προδῆλως μάλλον ἢ τῆς σῆς ὑπὲρ | γυναικός, ἢ τοῦ σοῦ γ' ὁμαίμονος λέγω; 'Since it is right for me to die before men's eyes labouring for this man rather than for that woman of yours, or should I say, your brother's?' Teucer's willingness to die in support of his brother's burial is paralleled in sentiment and language by *Ant.* 71–2 κείνον δ' ἐγὼ | θάψω. καλόν μοι τοῦτο ποιούσῃ θανεῖν. Middle ὑπερπονέομαι occurs only here (cf. perhaps the unique middle προπονέομαι at *OR* 685, if the text is correct); the active occurs in S. at *OC* 345.

Transmitted τοῦ σοῦ θ' cannot be construed: τε cannot mean 'even' (rightly Denniston 536). Most editors print τοῦ σοῦ γ' (*coni.* Bothe¹); for the corruption cf. *El.* 1416). Teucer attributes responsibility for the Trojan war to Helen (*El.* 541n.), a point often made by critics of the conflict (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 9.338–40 τί δὲ λαὸν ἀνήγαγεν ἐνθάδ' ἀγείρας | Ἀτρεΐδης; ἢ οὐκ Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠυκόμοιο; | ἢ μοῦνοι φιλέουσ' ἄλόχους μερόπων ἀνθρώπων | Ἀτρεΐδαι;, Aesch. *Ag.* 437–51). He refers to her first as 'that woman of yours' in a loose sense: she belongs by marriage to his family, and he is leading an expedition aimed at recovering her. He then specifies that she belongs to Menelaus, her husband, with γε after the disjunctive particle 'defin[ing] more sharply the new idea introduced' (Denniston 119). Critics since Eustathius 754.16–22 (II 722.2–12 Van der Valk) have cited Hom. *Il.* 9.327 ἀνδράσι μαρνάμενος δάρων ἔνεκα σφετεράων and 9.338–40 (above) to suggest that S. has Homeric precedent for describing Helen as belonging to both the Atridae. But 9.327 does not refer to Helen, while 9.338–40 does not say that Helen was Agamemnon's.

τοῦ σοῦ ξυναιμόνος (*coni.* Dindorf (1836) 333) gives the same sense as Bothe's without the attractive γε and via a less plausible error. σοῦ τοῦ θ' (*coni.* Bergk p. lv), supposing transposition of the possessive to its usual place between article and noun, gives '... or should I say, for you and your brother?' But this is an odd correction for Teucer to make. From the uncorrupt parts of the sentence we know that (i) Teucer refers to Helen as Agamemnon's wife and (ii) Teucer corrects himself immediately afterwards; Occam's Razor suggests that

the correction in (ii) is of the statement in (i). Garvie's interpretation (already partly countenanced by Kamerbeek) is different: Teucer at first implies that Helen was unfaithful to Menelaus with Agamemnon, before declaring that she divided her affections between the brothers (ἦν σου τοῦ θ', *coni.* Hertel (1856) 5–6, makes the same point). Such grotesque charges are so contrary to other accounts of even Helen's remarkable proclivities, that it would be surprising for Teucer to enunciate them in such an off-hand and obscure manner, especially since his other accusations are specific and detailed.

I print ὑπέρ, not ὑπερ (preferred by Wackernagel (1893) 15 n. 2 = (1953–79) II 1084 n. 2), because the preposition is preceded by an adjective qualifying its noun, not the noun itself (421–6n.).

1313 πρὸς ταῦθ' ὅρα μὴ τοῦμόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σόν. 'In view of this consider not my case, but your own, also.' For minatory πρὸς ταῦτα see 971n. For ὅρα see 784–5n.

1314–15 ὥς εἴ με πημανεῖς τι, βουλήσῃ ποτὲ | καὶ δειλὸς εἶναι μάλλον ἢ ἔμοι θρασύς. 'For if you cause me any trouble, in time you'll want to be a coward rather than bold towards me.' For πημανίω governing τι and a direct object cf. *OC* 837, Olson on *Ar. Ach.* 842. ποτὲ refers to an unspecified point in the future: Teucer admits that he cannot make good on his threat now. Of the variants for ἔν (omitted by some manuscripts: 43n.), γ' will be an attempt to fill the resulting hiatus, while π' (*coni.* Tyrwhitt (pre-1786), *prob.* Dawe, *STS* I 171–2) is less plausibly original than the rarer construction with ἐν. For the concluding antithetical formulation at the end of a speech see 132–3n.

1316–73 Odysseus' unexpected arrival resolves the impasse. His initial tone is neutral and conciliatory; indeed, he errs on the side of graciousness towards Teucer's party (1318–19, 1322–3). His subsequent speech on Ajax's behalf is a revelation. Underpinning Odysseus' argument are fundamental concepts such as justice (1335, 1342, 1344), honour (1339, 1342), and divine law (1343–4), none of which found a place in Teucer's two speeches. (Teucer made a single reference to justice in his stichomythia with Menelaus, but even that is brief and compromised: 1125n.) He ignores Agamemnon's absurd accusations against Teucer (1324, 1326–7), which would have been easy, if pointless, to refute, and concentrates on the real issue, the burial. His claim that Ajax deserves justice and honour is rhetorically powerful because he admits that he was Ajax's enemy. As a result, his assertion of Ajax's greatness cannot be ascribed to a biased viewpoint (1339–41); he also implies that Agamemnon may preserve his antipathy while allowing the burial.

The ethic which Odysseus espouses is not new, nor distinctive to tragedy, epic, or the historical contexts of either of those genres (cf. M. Heath (1987) 203). Similarly in the prologue, Odysseus' discourse on pity does not express a

new morality (121–6n.). In both scenes he encounters Ajax in an unfortunate state: as a madman, and as an unburied corpse. In the prologue this leads him to pity Ajax and the whole human condition; in the *exodos* he rather asserts Ajax's individual dignity and value, against an ethical backdrop forbidding mistreatment of the dead. In each case his solemn expression of a familiar ethical principle sets him apart from his interlocutor. In the prologue he is speaking to Athena, who takes a different position because she is a goddess; in the *exodos* Odysseus addresses a man, Agamemnon, and speaks with a view to changing his mind. Through his rhetorical skill Odysseus is able to put his principles into effect, which he had no opportunity to do in the prologue.

Agamemnon puts up some resistance to Odysseus' argument in the stichomythia which follows (1346–73, on which see Pfeiffer-Petersen (1996) 30–5). But after a pitiful attempt to justify the morality of his course (1348), he soon descends into criticism of Odysseus (1366; cf. 1346), demands for obedience (1352), and concern for his own position (1350, 1362). Odysseus is more focussed, concentrating first on what is καλόν (1347, 1349) and then on the importance of yielding to φίλοι (1351, 1353); under each of these headings Odysseus' second utterance is the stronger, expressed as a direct command. He then moves to reassert the value even of an enemy, and adds that friends can become enemies (1355–61). Ironically, this argument from malleability of character helps to secure the burial of someone who could never be accused of that vice, or virtue. At 1362 Agamemnon appears to concede the burial; Odysseus presses the point home, emphasising the potential gain to Agamemnon (1363, 1369) and Odysseus himself (1365, 1367). This emphasis on personal reward is the last stage in the rhetorical process, and sugars the potentially bitter decision (cf. *Phil.* 117, 119); but to get to this point Odysseus has relied on the basic morality on which his whole argument depends.

1316–17 Odysseus enters from eisodos A.

ἄναξ Ὀδυσσεῦ, καιρὸν ἴσθ' ἔληλυθώς, | εἰ μὴ ξυνάψων, ἀλλὰ συλλύσων
πάρει. 'Lord Odysseus, know that you have come at the right moment, if you have come not to make the tangle worse, but to untie it' (Lloyd-Jones). A chorus rarely initiates contact with a new arrival (979n.); Agamemnon and Teucer are too intent on their own argument to notice Odysseus' appearance. The honorific vocative immediately signals the chorus's changed attitude to Odysseus, even though they have no positive reason to adjust their earlier assessment (78n.). Repeated συν-, common in contexts of help and assistance (988n.), also suggests a more co-operative atmosphere. This marks the desperation of Ajax's party: if Odysseus, of all people, can be countenanced as a saviour, the situation is dire indeed. Moreover, the chorus have already adopted a surprising degree of tolerance in their remarks to Menelaus (1091–2n.), and of criticism towards Teucer (1118–19n.); they recently waived the opportunity to

attack Agamemnon, preferring to exhort both parties to *σωφροσύνη* (1264–5). So their tone is both a response to present necessity and the culmination of their relatively conciliatory function in the last two scenes.

For the metaphor cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 671 *κάθαρμα λύειν λόγου* and (more generally) *Ant.* 39–40 *τί δ', ὦ ταλαῖφρον, εἰ τάδ' ἐν τούτοις, ἐγὼ | λύουσ' ἄν εἴθ' ἄπτουσα προσθέιμην πλέον*; For the sense of *καιρός* cf. Eur. *Hel.* 479, Race (1981) 213 with n. 44.

1318–19 *τί δ' ἔστιν, ἄνδρες; τηλόθεν γὰρ ἡσθόμην | βοήν Ἀτρειδῶν τῷδ' ἐπ' ἀλκίμῳ νεκρῷ*. 'What is it, gentlemen? From far off I heard the shouting of the Atridae over this valiant corpse.' For *ἄνδρες* as an address to the chorus see 1093–6n. *γάρ* explains the question (cf. Denniston 80): 'I ask because I was far away and did not hear the details.' Through the paradoxical but respectful description of Ajax (cf. perhaps Hom. *Il.* 1.3–4 *πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἀϊδὶ προΐαψεν | ἥρώων*, with in effect a transferred epithet) Odysseus reciprocates the chorus's conciliation; so too he attributes the shouting (so loud that it is audible from afar) to the Atridae, without mentioning Teucer.

1320–1 *οὐ γὰρ κλύοντες ἔσμεν αἰσχίστους λόγους, | ἄναξ Ὀδυσσεύ, τοῦδ' ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς ἄρτίως*; 'Yes, for have I not been hearing most shameful words, lord Odysseus, from this man just now?' Agamemnon speaks these lines (*pace* West (1978b) 240, who follows L in attributing them to Teucer), for the following reasons (given by Ll-J/W, *Sol.*): (i) Odysseus refers to his shouting, and he attempts to justify himself: 'Yes, you did hear a shout, because . . .' (Denniston 80; cf. 1128). (ii) *ἄναξ Ὀδυσσεύ* suits Agamemnon, not Teucer; the latter, always more antagonistic than the chorus, will not adopt their conciliatory tone. (iii) Since Teucer still regards Odysseus as an enemy, he need not justify his conduct to him; Agamemnon, as Odysseus' peer, has an interest in retaining his respect.

κλύοντες is West's reinterpretation of manuscript *κλύοντες* (151–3n.).

1322–3 *ποίους; ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ συγγνώμην ἔχω | κλύοντι φλαῦρα συμβαλεῖν ἔπη κακά*. 'What words? For I can forgive a man who joins battle with abusive words after receiving insults.' Odysseus does not rush to judgment against Teucer; he rather leans the other way, suggesting that Teucer was provoked. The generalised statement (*ἀνδρὶ* rather than *Τεύκρῳ*) makes it easier for Agamemnon to accept the implied censure.

For the idea that one insult leads to, or justifies, another see *El.* 523–4n. (adding Pearson on fr. 929.4). While acknowledging its mitigating effect, Odysseus does not explicitly approve the maxim; his own conduct will transcend it. *κλύοντι* for manuscript *κλύοντι* is owed to West (151–3n.): hearing precedes speaking, and so requires the aorist. For *φλαῦρα* of abusive speech see 1161–2n. For *συμβαλεῖν ἔπη κακά* (the prefix conveying a conflict between

two sides) cf. Eur. *LI* 830 αἰσχρὸν δέ μοι γυναιξὶ συμβάλλειν λόγους, *Med.* 44–5 συμβαλὼν | ἔχθραν... αὐτῇ, 521, *El.* 905–6, *Ba.* 837, Hom. *Il.* 12.181 σὺν δ’ ἔβαλον Λαπιθαὶ πόλεμον καὶ δηϊοτήτα.

1324 ἤκουσεν αἰσχρά· δρῶν γὰρ ἦν τοιαῦτ’ ἐμέ. ‘He did hear shameful words: for he was *doing* shameful things to me.’ Agamemnon concedes that his account in 1320–1 was one-sided, but still distinguishes his words from Teucer’s deeds. The absurdity of the claim (Teucer has only words, not deeds, at his disposal) led to the misattribution of the line to Teucer in some manuscripts, but 1325–6 indicate that it belongs to Agamemnon. The present participle with εἰμί (cf. 1330, Bruhn §108) carries the main burden, while ἐμέ (*coni.* Paley, 1888 edn p. 106 for transmitted με) has a secondary emphasis. For the periphrasis δρῶν... ἦν (present participle plus imperfect indicative) see Diggle (1981a) 103.

1325 τί γὰρ σ’ ἔδρασεν ὥστε καὶ βλάβην ἔχειν; ‘What did he do to you to cause you injury?’ ὥστε καὶ limits and specifies the result of the main verb: cf. Eur. *Hel.* 841 πῶς οὖν θανούμεθ’ ὥστε καὶ δόξαν λαβεῖν; Denniston 299. For βλάβην ἔχειν ‘experience injury’ cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 799 ὡς ταῦτ’ Ὀρέστην δρῶντα μὴ βλάβας ἔχειν.

1326–7 οὐ φησ’ ἔασιν τόνδε τὸν νεκρὸν ταφῆς | ἄμοιρον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς βίαν θάψειν ἐμοῦ. ‘He says that he will not allow this corpse to go without its portion of burial, but will bury it in defiance of me.’ Agamemnon characteristically focusses on the slight to himself, not his reasons for denying burial. For expressions parallel to οὐ φησ’ ἔασιν see *El.* 1205–10n. For the genitive after the negative compound adjective see 321–2n. For ἀλλά introducing a positive clause still formally subordinate to a negated main verb see 481–4n. πρὸς βίαν... ἐμοῦ is equivalent to βίᾳ ἐμοῦ (cf. *Ant.* 79, 907 βίᾳ πολιτῶν, also of a forbidden burial, and, for πρὸς with the accusative denoting manner, *El.* 369n.).

1328–9 ἔξεστιν οὖν εἰπόντι τάληθῇ φίλῳ | σοὶ μηδὲν ἥσσον ἢ πάρος ξυνηρετῆιν; ‘So is it permitted for a friend to speak the truth and be your ally no less than before?’ Frankness can ruin friendship (cf. Ter. *Andr.* 68 *obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit*), and so Odysseus, rather than immediately attacking Agamemnon’s case, politely requests permission to speak (Dunbar on Ar. *Az.* 381–2 cites parallels for ἔξεστι in such requests).

ξυνηρετῆιν (*coni.* Lobeck¹) is superior to transmitted –τμεῖν, since the derivation is from ἐρέτης ‘rower’, not ἐρετμόν ‘oar’. The metaphorical sense is hardly felt, if at all, as with the commoner ὑπηρέτης, ὑπηρετώ (cf. Van Nes (1963) 121–2). (A further variant, ξυνηρεμεῖν in GRZc, means ‘remain stationary also’: thus LSJ⁹ s.v. συνηρεμέω, with one late attestation.) For the form cf. Phot. 1311 Porson ξυνηρέτης· σύμφωνα· ὡς ὁ ἐναντίος, ἀντηρέτης [Porson: ἀντιρ–

Phot.] (the latter attested at Aesch. *Sept.* 283); also 1 331 Porson ὁμηρέταις [Lobeck¹, on our passage: –ίταις Phot.]· ὁμοψήφοις· ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁμοῦ ἐρέσσειν· ὁμογνώμοσιν (cf. Hesych. ο 716 = π 757 Latte). At Eur. fr. 282.7 *TrGF* either κάξυπηρετεῖν (Galen) or καὶ ξυνηρετεῖν (Athenaeus cod. A) is possible (cf. Collard (1969) 175 = (2007) 82); the latter is corrupted to καὶ ξυνηρετμεῖν in two manuscripts of Athenaeus. At Eur. 776.3 *TrGF* συνηρετεῖ (*coni.* Meineke) is probably superior to transmitted συνηρεφεῖ.

1330–1 εἶπ' ἥ γὰρ εἶην οὐκ ἂν εὖ φρονῶν, ἐπεὶ | φίλον σ' ἐγὼ μέγιστον Ἀργείων νέμω. 'Speak: for otherwise I would not be in my right mind, since I consider you my most important friend among the Argives.' Having made this concession, it will be harder for Agamemnon to reject his advice. Odysseus' closeness to Agamemnon has precedent in tragedy (Aesch. *Ag.* 841–2 μόνος δ' Ὀδυσσεύς, ὅσπερ οὐχ ἐκὼν ἐπλεῖ, | ζευχθεὶς ἔτοιμος ἦν ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος) and epic (Hom. *Il.* 4.360–1 οἶδα γάρ, ὥς τοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν | ἥπια δήνεα οἶδε· τὰ γὰρ φρονέεις ἅ τ' ἐγὼ περ).

For γάρ meaning 'for otherwise' cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 90 καὶ κάρτα γ' ἥ γὰρ οὐ σοφοὶ φαίνοίμεθ' ἂν (also after an offer of potentially irritating advice), Denniston 62–3. The strong pause after the elided monosyllable εἶπ' confused scribes, leading to the variants ἐπεὶ γ' ἂν (L), ἥπει γ' ἂν (Λ), and ἥ που γ' ἂν (τ); these lack an affirmative answer to Odysseus' question. For the present participle with εἶμι see 1324n. For the sense of μέγιστος see Pearson (1929b) 168, *El.* 46n.

1332–3 ἄκούε νυν. τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδε πρὸς θεῶν | μὴ τλῆς ἄθαιπτον ᾧδ' ἀναλγήτως βαλεῖν. 'Then listen. By the gods, do not bring yourself to cast this man out unburied so ruthlessly.' With νυν (thus Turnebus for manuscript νῦν) Odysseus emphasises that he will hold Agamemnon to his word. Prominent τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδε (cf. *OR* 449–51, Tiresias, on the killer of Laius, τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον... οὗτός ἐστιν ἐνθάδε) returns the focus to Ajax's body rather than the dispute between Agamemnon and Teucer. πρὸς θεῶν adds emotion to the request, but also prefigures Odysseus' later reference to divine law (1343–4n.). For βαλεῖν see 1308–9n., for ἀναλγήτως cf. 946: Odysseus' vocabulary recalls that of Agamemnon's opponents.

1334–5 μῆδ' ἥ βία σε μηδαμῶς νικησάτω | τοσόνδε μισεῖν ὥστε τὴν δίκην πατεῖν. 'Nor should brute force so master you that your hatred causes you to trample on justice.' Odysseus urges rejection of mere violence (characteristic of Menelaus at e.g. 1067–70, 1159–60) in favour of justice (for the contrast cf. Eur. *IA* 314–16, Hom. *Il.* 16.387–8, Hes. *Op.* 275, Thuc. 4.62.3 ἡ τῷ δικαίῳ ἡ βίᾳ πράξειν, Moschion *TrGF* 97 F 6.15–16 ἦν δ' ὁ μὲν νόμος | ταπεινός, ἡ βία δὲ σύνθρονος Διί). For 'trampling on justice' cf. fr. 683.2–3 *TrGF* τὰ μὲν δίκαια καὶ τὰ σώφρονα | λάγδην πατεῖται, Aesch. *Ag.* 381–4, *Cho.* 642–3 διαὶ Δίκας... |

λάξ πέδον πατούμενας, *Eum.* 539–43, *Pl. Leg.* 714a καταπατήσας... τοὺς νόμους, Headlam on Herodas 8.58; also *Ant.* 745 οὐ γὰρ σέβεις, τιμός γε τὰς θεῶν πατῶν, *Hom. Il.* 4.157 κατὰ δ' ὄρκια πιστὰ πάτησαν.

1336–7 κάμοι γὰρ ἦν ποθ' οὗτος ἔχθιστος στρατοῦ, | ἐξ οὗ κράτησα τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὅπλων. 'For this man was once most hateful of the army to me too, ever since I gained control over the arms of Achilles.' Ll-J/W suggest οὗχθιστος (a crasis error: 39n.), but the superlative accompanied by a genitive noun does not need an article. The aphaeresis in κράτησα was restored as a correction in Q, and then by Bentley (pre-1742) 245. For the verb cf. *Phil.* 1292 κράτει τῶν σῶν ὅπλων, *Thuc.* 3.47.3 ὅπλων ἐκράτησεν, 8.71.2. Adjectival Ἀχιλλείων replaces a genitive (41n.).

1338–41 ἀλλ' αὐτὸν ἔμπας ὄντ' ἐγὼ τοιόνδ' ἐμοὶ | οὐ τᾶν ἀτιμάσαιμ' ἄν, ὥστε μὴ λέγειν | ἐν' ἀνδρ' ἰδεῖν ἄριστον Ἀργείων, ὅσοι | Τροίαν ἀφικόμεσθα, πλὴν Ἀχιλλέως. 'But although he was like that to me, I would not dishonour him, so as to deny that he was the greatest man that I saw among us Argives who came to Troy, except for Achilles.' Odysseus praises Ajax as 'best after Achilles'; contrast Ajax's arrogant claim to be best without exception (421–6n.). Many scholars take Odysseus' words as an acknowledgement that Ajax ought to have been awarded the Arms. But (i) Odysseus' speech is a generous tribute to a dead and dishonoured man with a specific rhetorical purpose, not a dispassionate assessment of his merits. It cannot be fairly used to second-guess the verdict of the tribunal, or Odysseus' opinion of it. (ii) The criteria for the award of the Arms are nowhere specified, and so the audience cannot properly assume a miscarriage of justice. Ajax is ἄριστος after Achilles in some areas, to be sure, but he was plainly deficient in others. By speaking of his enemy in this way, Odysseus reveals his moral superiority to his rival. (Cf. Hesk (2003) 61–2, Van Erp Taalman Kip (1996) 530.) (iii) Odysseus makes no attempt to surrender the weapons to Ajax's heir, which would be the logical step for a generous man to take if he were claiming that an injustice had occurred.

ἔμπας accompanies the participle (cf. 15–17n.); for the vocalism see 121–2n. οὐ τᾶν (*coni.* Elmsley (1814) 486) for manuscript οὐκ ἄν restores the metre; Triclinius's οὐκ ἄν γ' is an unhappy attempt to do the same. (At *Ant.* 747, compared by Dawe, *STS* 1 172, Erfurdt makes the same, widely accepted, emendation as Elmsley; there οὐκ ἄν γ' is in AUY as well as Triclinius.) τοι is delayed until the crucial point (Denniston 547–8): that is, Odysseus' disclaiming of a desire to dishonour Ajax. The further variant οὐκουν looks like a minuscule error (ου for α), as (in reverse) at [1036]; neither this nor οὐκ οὖν (Pearson) can appear at this place in a sentence. οὐκ ἀντατιμάσαιμ' (*coni.* Bothe²), the dominant reading until recent editions, introduces a *hapax* with unwelcome sense (Ajax is not said to have 'dishonoured' Odysseus, so Odysseus

could not ‘dishonour him in return’). For intensive εἰς with a superlative see 636/7–637/8n.

1342 ὦστ’ οὐκ ἂν ἐνδίκως γ’ ἀτιμάζοιτο σοί· ‘So he would not be justly dishonoured by you.’ The emphatic pronoun elucidates the *a fortiori* argument: since I, Odysseus says to Agamemnon, with all my reasons to hate him, still do him honour, you have no excuse for dishonouring him.

1343–4 οὐ γάρ τι τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεῶν νόμους | φθείροις ἄν. ‘For you would be destroying not him, but the laws of the gods.’ Odysseus climactically raises the issue of divine law (1128–31n.). For φθείρω cf. Pl. *Leg.* 958c ὅλην τὴν πόλιν καὶ νόμους φθείρων and διαφθείρω at *ibid.* 685a, Dem. 24.214, Isocr. 18.11.

1344–5 ἄνδρα δ’ οὐ δίκαιον, εἰ θάνοι, | βλάπτειν τὸν ἐσθλόν, οὐδ’ ἐὰν μισῶν κυρῆς. ‘It is not just to harm a noble man if he dies, not even if you happen to hate him.’ Even enemies deserve justice (cf. Tr. Adesp. fr. 5 *TrGF* ἐχθρὸς μὲν ἀνὴρ, ἀλλὰ τὴν δίκην σέβω), and should not be pursued beyond death (cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 528–30, Lys. 2.7–8). The sentence begins as if it was going to enunciate the principle ‘don’t harm the dead’ (cf. Diog. Laert. 1.70 τὸν τεθνηκότα μὴ κακολογεῖν, Plut. *Sol.* 21.1, Otto (1890) 230), but shifts at τὸν ἐσθλόν (Budelmann (2000) 40–2) to emphasise that Ajax was not just any dead person. τὸν ἐσθλόν cannot be the subject of βλάπτειν (‘the noble man should not harm . . .’), since the emphasis is on Ajax’s status, not Agamemnon’s (cf. 1352). For the choice of θάνοι over θάνη (*coni.* Wunder!) see 520–1n.

1346 σὺ ταῦτ’, Ὀδυσσεῦ, τοῦδ’ ὑπερμαχεῖς ἐμοί; ‘You, Odysseus, fight like this for him against me?’ ὑπερμαχέω is tragic in classical Greek: cf. *OR* 264–5 ἐγὼ τὰδ’, ὥσπερ εἰ τοῦμοῦ πατρός, | ὑπερμαχοῦμαι (with cognate accusative, as here), *Ant.* 194, Eur. *Phoen.* [1252].

1347 ἐγωγ’ ἐμίσουν δ’, ἡνίκ’ ἦν μισεῖν καλόν. ‘I do: I hated him when it was proper to do so.’ For ἐγωγε responding to a question see 104n. Odysseus ‘does not deny to enmity its essential place in human life: but that place, he believes, is in honourable contest with a living foe’ (M. Heath (1987) 203, citing Pind. *P.* 9.95–6 κείνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν | παντὶ θυμῷ σὺν τε δίκῃ καλὰ ῥέζοντ’ ἔννεπεν). He refers to the time before Ajax’s madness: his reaction to Ajax insane was not hatred, but pity (121–6).

1348 οὐ γάρ θανόντι καὶ προσεμβῆναί σε χρή; ‘You mean you shouldn’t also tread upon the man now that he is dead?’ Agamemnon’s advocacy of this course (elsewhere something that one condemns or attributes to others: 988–9n.) highlights his moral deficiency. καὶ emphasises that the proposed trampling is an addition to the hatred described in 1347. For γάρ see 101–2n. προσεμβῆναι (*hapax*) may be a metrically convenient alternative for the usual

ἐπεμβῆναι (*El.* 456, 836, *Eurypylus* p. 38.47 *TrGF*S (*coni.*: 988–9n.), *Eur. Hipp.* [668], and see Lobeck's n.). *σε* is used rather than *με* (*coni.* Van Leeuwen (1881) 181 n. 3), even though Agamemnon's behaviour is really at issue, because the nominal topic is still Odysseus' attitude (as in 1346–7).

1349 μὴ χαῖρ', Ἀτρεΐδῃ, κέρδεσιν τοῖς μὴ καλοῖς. 'Do not take pleasure, son of Atreus, in unrighteous advantages.' κέρδος appears in this context at Moschion 97 F 7.1 *TrGF* <τί> κέρδος οὐκέτ' ὄντας ἄκίζειν νεκρούς;

1350 τόν τοι τύραννον εὐσεβεῖν οὐ ῥᾴδιον. 'It is not easy, I tell you, for a monarch to be righteous.' Agamemnon admits by implication that his conduct is not εὐσεβής: his capitulation is not far off. Cf. fr. 524 *TrGF* (*Polyxena*), where a leader (probably Agamemnon) states οὐ γάρ τις ἂν δύναίτο πρῶράτης στρατοῦ | τοῖς πᾶσιν εἶξαι καὶ προσαρκέσαι χάριν, before asking 'If Zeus cannot do everything, how can I?' For proverbial τοι see 455–6n.

1351 ἀλλ' εὖ λέγουσι τοῖς φίλοις τιμὰς νέμειν. 'But people well say that one should give friends their due portion of honour.' Moving away from abstract morality, Odysseus makes it easier for Agamemnon to concede by stressing the favour that Agamemnon would be doing to him: Agamemnon furthers his interest by putting him under an obligation. Elsewhere statements which advocate the heeding of advice (cf. *Hes. Op.* 295 ἐσθλὸς δ' αὖ καὶ κείνος, ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθηται, *S. Ant.* 723 καὶ τῶν λεγόντων εὖ καλὸν τὸ μαρθάνειν, and *Hdt.* 7.16α.1 Ἴσον ἐκεῖνο, ὃ βασιλεῦ, παρ' ἐμοὶ κέκριται, φρονεῖν τε εὖ καὶ τῷ λέγοντι χρηστὰ ἐθέλειν πείθεσθαι, the last two addressed, as here, to rulers) emphasise what the addressees should do, not their capacity to confer a benefit on others.

1352 κλύειν τὸν ἐσθλὸν ἄνδρα χρή τῶν ἐν τέλει. 'The noble man should listen to those in command.' Agamemnon applies this standard idea (cf. *Ant.* 666–7 ἀλλ' ὃν πόλις στήσσει, τοῦδε χρή κλύειν | καὶ σμικρὰ καὶ δίκαια καὶ τάναντία [*del.* Blaydes], *Phil.* 925–6 τῶν γὰρ ἐν τέλει κλύειν | τό τ' ἐνδικόν με καὶ τὸ συμφέρον ποεῖ) to Ajax, picking up Odysseus' concluding description of him as ἐσθλός (1345). Some commentators see a reference to Odysseus, but since Agamemnon has issued him no orders, he cannot be charged with disobedience. οἱ ἐν τέλει is first found in Herodotus, and recurs in tragedy at *Ant.* 67, *Phil.* [385], 925, *Eur.* fr. 727c.38 *TrGF*; see further Fraenkel on *Aesch. Ag.* 105 for τέλος and related words in this sense.

The reading of the secondary tradition τὸν ἐσθλὸν ἄνδρα χρή κλύειν (*Eustathius* 800.9 = III 51.16–17 Van der Valk; also Σ rec. on *Hom. Il.* 10.224 in *Par. Gr.* 2681 *ap.* Cramer *Anec. Par.* III 87.5–6, ending τὸν ἐντελεῖ) puts κλύειν immediately after χρή, its expected position in prose; but the key idea κλύειν is better placed prominently.

1353 παῦσαι· κρατεῖς τοι τῶν φίλων νικώμενος. ‘Stop! You are still the master, you know, if you let your friends vanquish you’ (thus Sommerstein, in his edition of Aeschylus, II p. 110 n. 199). For the idea cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 943 πιθοῦ· κρατεῖς μέντοι παρείς γ’ ἐκὼν ἐμοί [Weil: κράτος . . . πάρες γ’ cod.], Tr. Adesp. fr. 40 *TrGF* φίλων γὰρ ἄρξεις μὴ κρατῶν ὅσον θέλεις. For παῦσαι in firm but friendly remonstrance in stichomythia cf. Eur. *Her.* 1398 (Theseus to Heracles) παῦσαι· δίδου δὲ χεῖρ’ ὑπηρέτη φίλω; there is no need to substitute πιθοῦ (Nauck⁶ p. 196, ‘ein milderes Wort’), πάρες (Postgate (1924) 10), or πάσαις (Markland, in his edition of Euripides’ *Supplices*, p. 249, citing Lucian 29.18 for the sense ‘by all votes’; this also delays τοι to third in its clause). For τοι in remonstrance see Denniston 540–1. For νικάσμαι with a bare passive, and in this sense, see 330n. ἡσώμενος (thus Aristides 23.71 = p. 51.22 Keil) simplifies the construction by reading a verb more often found with a bare genitive (LSJ⁹ s.v. ἡσώσμαι I 4).

1354 μέμνησ’ ὁποῖω φωτὶ τὴν χάριν δίδως. ‘Remember what sort of man is the recipient of your kindness’ (Lloyd-Jones). In Agamemnon’s view, Ajax has failed to show the χάρις which would merit χάρις in return (522). For χάρις and memory see 520–2n.

1355 ὅδ’ ἐχθρὸς ἀνὴρ, ἀλλὰ γενναῖός ποτ’ ἦν. ‘This man was an enemy, but he was once noble.’ Odysseus replies by stating exactly what sort of a man (ὁποῖος) Ajax was. For ἀνὴρ (Erfurdt) see 9–10n. For ἀλλά introducing a second clause which ‘states a consideration which goes some way towards invalidating the first’ see Denniston 5–6.

1356 τί ποτε ποιήσεις; ἐχθρὸν ὦδ’ αἰδῇ νέκυν; ‘What ever will you do? Are you showing such respect to the corpse of an enemy?’ Agamemnon seems only to have heard the former of Odysseus’ adjectives. For the orthography of ποιήσεις see 1152–5n.

1357 νικᾷ γὰρ ἀρετὴ με τῆς ἔχθρας πολὺ. ‘Yes, for his valour, rather than his enmity, strongly prevails with me.’ For affirmative γὰρ see 82n. ἀρετὴ refers to Ajax’s valour (corresponding to γενναῖος, 1355), τῆς ἔχθρας to his hatred for Odysseus (Agamemnon’s reply, referring to Ajax’s inconsistency, demands this sense, which is also the most natural in context: this is no time for Odysseus to discuss his own ἀρετὴ or ἔχθρα). For νικάω see 330n.; Pearson’s κινεῖ (‘moves me’, Raeburn) obscures the irresistible force of Ajax’s ἀρετὴ. The genitive τῆς ἔχθρας is given its construction by the idea of preference in νικᾷ, which yields a statement parallel to *Phil.* 1100/1 λωίονος δαίμονος εἴλου τὸ κάκιον αἰνεῖν. For νικᾷ . . . πολὺ cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 1052 νικῶν πολὺ with Garvie. The gloss πλέον (which intruded into the text of C: 28n.) unnecessarily attempts a clearer construction for the genitive, as does πάρος (*coni.* Nauck⁶ p. 196). A

different approach, which emends με to τό (Dawe, *STS* 1 172) or τά (Wolff² p. 143), leaves the line without a proper caesura.

1358 τοιοῖδε μέντοι φῶτες ἐμπληκτοὶ βροτῶν. ‘Such people are the inconsistent among humanity.’ The reference is to Ajax (thus a Byzantine scholium at Dindorf p. 236.26–8, Winnington-Ingram (1979) 4, (1980) 68–9, Blundell (1989) 98 n. 190). Whereas Odysseus highlights Ajax’s ἀρετή over his ἐχθρα, for Agamemnon the existence of both in the same person is ground for further criticism. Agamemnon is not speaking about Odysseus, for the following reasons (some taken from the scholars named above). (i) ἐμπληκτος would be a very strong criticism for Agamemnon to voice of Odysseus. (ii) Nowhere else in the stichomythia does Agamemnon refer to Odysseus in the third person (1366, a proverb, does not count); this would be a startling breach of contact, itself followed by an abrupt resumption of contact in Agamemnon’s next line. (iii) The third-person referent in Agamemnon’s utterances at 1352, 1354, 1356 and 1360, and in Odysseus’ at 1355, 1357, and 1359, is Ajax; it would require clear signalling, such as is absent from this line, for this pattern to be broken. If 1358 referred to Odysseus, then one could try to give at least 1359 and 1360 the same referent; but this would make Odysseus’ remark at 1359 into something of a threat, and render Agamemnon’s question in 1360 inconsequential.

For emphatic μέντοι after a demonstrative see 952–3n. A positive (i.e. not comparative or superlative) adjective accompanying a genitive like βροτῶν, but lacking the article, may refer to a class of people contained within the larger class of all humanity: cf. Eur. *Her.* 846 οὐδ’ ἥδομαι φοιτῶσ’ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπων φίλους (see Bond), *Bacch.* 472 (ῥρηγία) ἄρρητ’ ἀβακχεύτοισιν εἰδέναι βροτῶν, Agathon *TrGF* 39 F 7 φαῦλοι βροτῶν γὰρ τοῦ πονεῖν ἡσσωμένοι | θανεῖν ἐρῶσιν, Pind. *I.* 5.26–7 καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ | λόγον ἐκέρδαναν. (We should disregard examples involving vocatives, for which cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 744 ὦ κενοὶ βροτῶν, 949, K–G 1 339, and demonstratives, for which cf. S. fr. 837.1–2 ὡς τρισόλβιοι | κείνοι βροτῶν, οἱ κτλ.) These parallels defend the paradosis against οὐμπληκτοὶ (*coni.* Blaydes¹ p. 341; for crasis errors see 39n.), for which cf. *Phil.* 304 οὐκ ἐνθάδ’ οἱ πλοῖ τοῖσι σώφροσιν βροτῶν, *OC* 279 πρὸς τὸν εὐσεβῆ βροτῶν, Eur. *Med.* 755, *IA* [922–3], fr. 944 *TrGF*, Dionysius 76 F 11.

βροτῶν has a minority variant βροτοῖς, which also appears in a few manuscripts at Eur. *Med.* 755 (cited above); in each case, the uncommon use of the genitive will have facilitated corruption. Parallel variants are present at Hes. *Op.* 257, where either is possible (see West). For the pleonasm φῶτες . . . βροτῶν cf. Hom. *Od.* 17.587–8 οὐ γὰρ πω τινες ὧδε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων | ἀνέρες ὑβρίζοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανόωνται, 23.187 ἀνδρῶν δ’ οὐκ ἐν τῷ ζῶσι βροτός, Xen. *Cyr.* 2.2.11 ἀνὴρ τὸν τρόπον τῶν στρυφνοτέρων ἀνθρώπων; at *OC* 280–1 φυγὴν δὲ τοῦ | μήπω γενέσθαι φωτὸς ἀνοσίου βροτῶν the final word is

probably corrupt, given βροτῶν in the same place in 279 and the lack of an article.

For ἐμπληκτος ‘inconsistent’, often with the additional nuance ‘unstable’ (Σ p. 254 Chr. εὐμετάβλητος), cf. Eur. *Tro.* 1204–6 τοῖς τρόποις γὰρ αἱ τύχαι, | ἐμπληκτος ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλοσε | πηδῶσι (where see Knox (1966) 228 with n. 41 = (1979) 242 with 248 n. 41), Hom. *Od.* 20.132 ἐμπλήγηδην (thus Aristarchus; not ‘foolish’, *pace* Van der Valk (1949) 119), Thuc. 3.82.4, Pl. *Gorg.* 482a, *Lys.* 214c ἐμπλήκτους τε καὶ ἀσταθμήτους, Arist. *EE* 1240b17 τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας ἕτερος καὶ ἐμπληκτος.

1359 ἡ κάρτα πολλοὶ νῦν φίλοι καὺθις πικροί. ‘Indeed there are many now friends who will later be bitter foes.’ Odysseus acknowledges that Ajax did change (cf. 1336–7, 1355), but still deflects Agamemnon’s criticism. For πικρός in statements of mutability cf. *OC* 615 τὰ τερπνὰ πικρὰ γίγνεται καὺθις φίλα, Aesch. *Cho.* 234 τοὺς φιλάτους γὰρ οἶδα νῶν ὄντας πικρούς.

1360 τοιούσδ’ ἐπαινεῖς δῆτα σὺ κτᾶσθαι φίλους; ‘So you advise me to get friends like these?’ For δῆτα (v.l. δῆ; cf. 879/80) in questions see 42n.

1361 σκληράν ἐπαινεῖν οὐ φιλῶ ψυχὴν ἐγώ. ‘I do not like to approve an unbending soul.’ For σκληρός cf. *Tr.* 1259–60 (Heracles, in self-address) ἄγε νυν... | ... ὦ ψυχὴ σκληρά, *Ant.* 473 τὰ σκλήρ’ ἄγαν φρονήματα. With ἐπαινεῖν Odysseus uses the same word, in the same place, as Agamemnon (cf. also φίλους / φιλῶ), turning round the content of his question to refer to Agamemnon himself.

1362 ἡμᾶς σὺ δειλοὺς τῇδε θήμερᾳ φανείς. ‘You will show us to be cowards on this day.’ Any leader could use Agamemnon’s argument, irrespective of the justice of his case: any change of plan can be represented as an act of cowardice. The implication is that the substantive argument is lost. For τῇδε θήμερᾳ cf. 756–7n.

1363 ἀνδρας μὲν οὖν Ἕλλησι πᾶσιν ἐνδίκους. ‘No, but rather men who are just in the eyes of all the Greeks.’ Burying the dead, and not mistreating them, was a panhellenic νόμος; cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 311, 526–7, 671–2, Hdt. 9.78.2–9.79.1. For μὲν οὖν correcting a previous utterance see Denniston 475.

1364 ἀνωγας οὖν με τὸν νεκρὸν θάπτειν ἔαν; ‘So you are ordering me to allow the burial of the corpse?’

1365 ἔγωγε· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐνθάδ’ ἵξομαι. ‘Yes I do: for I myself will come to that need.’ For Odysseus’ justification cf. fr. 381 *TrGF* μηδὲ τῷ τεθνηκότι | τὸν ζῶντ’ ἐπαυχεῖν [Tyrwhitt: ἐπαρκεῖν codd.] αὐτὸν ὡς θανοῦμενον and 121–6n. Agamemnon’s reply, which accuses Odysseus of selfishness, ignores his reasoning and refers to the bare fact of his dissent. Campbell (in his edition and

PS) argues for ‘that is the course I mean to take’, but a unilateral declaration does not fit the paraenetic context. For ἔγωγε responding to questions see 1041. For ἐνθάδε referring to preceding θάπτειν cf. *OR* 1157 (Θε.) ἔδωκ’ ὀλέσθαι δ’ ὠφελον τῇδ’ ἡμέρᾳ. | (Οι.) ἀλλ’ ἐς τόδ’ ἤξεις μὴ λέγων γε τοῦνδικον; also probably *Men.* fr. 873 *PCG* ἐπὶ τοῦτ’ ἐγένοντο πάντες, ἐνθάδ’ ἤξομεν [*Porson* (pre-1808a) 290: ἐνθα λήξ– codd.] (cited by *Stob. Ecl.* 4.56.6 = *W–H V* 1124.10 in the section entitled παρηγορικά, and surrounded by maxims relating to death).

1366 ἢ πάνθ’ ὅμοια· πᾶς ἀνὴρ αὐτῷ πονεῖ. ‘Ah, it’s all the same. Every man works for himself.’ ‘The egocentric Agamemnon is incapable of understanding Odysseus’ moving appeal to our common mortality and misinterprets it as the sort of selfish consideration he himself would be likely to follow’ (MD). For the thought cf. *Antisthenes* fr. 14.4 *Caizzi* σχεδὸν μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἅπαντα ὅμοια (from a speech delivered by Ajax; our play could have been in the author’s mind), *Ter. Phorm.* 264 *ecce autem similia omnia! omnes congruunt: unum quom noris, omnis noris*, *Bühler* on *Zen. Ath.* 2.9 (iv 100). More generally, for the allegation of self-interest cf. *OC* 309 τίς γὰρ ἐσθλὸς οὐχ αὐτῷ φίλος;, *Eur. Med.* 86 πᾶς τίς αὐτὸν τοῦ πέλας μᾶλλον φιλεῖ, *Harder* on *Eur.* fr. 452.2 *TrGF*.

Punctuation after ὅμοια (implied by a Byzantine scholium in *G*, p. 350 Chr., ὄντως πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ὅμοια· πᾶς γὰρ ἀνὴρ τὴν οἰκείαν πραγματεύεται σωτηρίαν, and adopted by *Dobree* (pre-1825) ii 45) gives a verbless phrase with the adjective (perhaps colloquial), for which cf. *Aesch. Ag.* 1239 καὶ τῶνδ’ ὁμοιον εἴ τι μὴ πείθω, 1403–4 σὺ δ’ αἰνέειν εἶτε με ψέγειν θέλεις, | ὁμοιον, *Men. Epit.* 1088, *Sam.* 366 (as punctuated by *Gronewald* (1995) 58–9), *Collard* on *Eur. Suppl.* 1069, (2005a) 368. *Jebb* takes πάνθ’ ὅμοια as adverbial (‘in all things alike’), which is less vigorous, and gives an awkward combination of adjacent accusatives of respect (πάντα) and manner (ὅμοια). For the accentuation of ὁμοιος see 550–1n. For πονεῖ with a dative of interest cf. 1415, *Eur. Her.* 388 Μυκηναίῳ πονῶν τυράννῳ. The minority variant φρονεῖ could result from confusion between π and φ (61n.) or emendation aimed at recasting the expression in intellectual terms (34–5n.).

1367 τῷ γὰρ με μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἢ ἑαυτῷ πονεῖν; ‘Indeed: for who else ought I to work for apart from myself?’ Odysseus concedes the point, ‘which helps his cause by making the favour seem done to *him*’ (*Jebb*). Cf. the tyrannical variant *Ant.* 736 ἄλλω γὰρ ἢ μοι χρεὶ με τῇσδ’ ἄρχειν χθονός;

1368 σὸν ἄρα τοῦργον, οὐκ ἐμὸν κεκλήσεται. ‘The deed will be called yours, then, not mine.’ For ἄρα see 738–9n. The minority variants σοῦ γ’ and σὸν γὰρ are better accounted for by assuming that ‘σὸν became σοῦ, the γ’ was inserted to avoid the hiatus, and lived on in the form of γὰρ in some MSS’ (*Dawe, STS* 1 173) than by positing original σόν γ’ (*coni.* *Porson* on *Eur. Phoen.*

1366; rejected by Lowe (1973) 59 as no improvement on the majority reading). Elmsley (1814) 487 suggests σὸν τᾶρα, comparing for the τοι *El.* 624 σύ τοι λέγεις νιν, οὐκ ἐγώ, Aesch. *Cho.* 923 σύ τοι σεαυτὴν, οὐκ ἐγώ, κατακτενεῖς, Eur. *Held.* 733 σύ τοι βραδύνεις, οὐκ ἐγώ; but none of his parallels contains τοι and ἄρα simultaneously. The future perfect κεκλήσεται describes a permanent stigma (see Ruijgh (1976) 378 = (1991–6) 1 746).

1369 ὥδ' ἦν ποιήσης, πανταχῇ χρηστός γ' ἔση. 'If you act like this, you will be noble in every way.' Transmitted ὡς ἄν is changed by Polle (1897) 260 to ὥδ' ἄν, and then by Broadhead (1968) 72 to ὥδ' ἦν (since ἄν representing ἔάν is 'alien to the tragic language': West (1991) 300). The paradosis means 'however you act' (cf. Ar. *Pax* 24 ὥσπερ ἄν χέση τις with N. Wilson (2007) 99–100, Pl. *Symp.* 181a, *Crat.* 424e, *Leg.* 881d, Ap. Rh. 2.345, 3.350), but 'Agamemnon will have acted rightly not whatever he may do but if he does what Odysseus wishes him to do' (Ll-J/W, *So.*). If original ὠΔΗΝ became ὠΣΗΝ by a graphic error, the further change of eta to alpha would have given a more familiar combination. Elsewhere in S. ὡς ἄν always denotes purpose (Jebb lists 8 instances), which makes the paradosis still more suspicious.

For the orthography of ποιήσης see 1152–5n. πανταχῇ 'in every way' is preferable to the minority variant πανταχοῦ 'everywhere'; for the corruption cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 198, Eur. *Med.* 364, *IT* 68, *Phoen.* 265, *Or.* 760, Ar. *Lys.* 1230, and (in reverse) at *Hec.* 1328, *Andr.* 241, and *Her.* 845.

1370–1 ἀλλ' εὖ γε μέντοι τοῦτ' ἐπίστασ', ὡς ἐγώ | σοὶ μὲν νέμοιμ' ἂν τῆσδε καὶ μείζω χάριν. 'Well, be sure that I would do for you an even greater favour than this.' ἀλλά has the nuance 'well, if you persist in your foolish behaviour' (FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 930); for this particle with μέντοι with assentient force see Denniston 411. For τῆσδε καὶ μείζω χάριν cf. *OR* 763–4 ἄξιος γάρ, οἷ' ἄνηρ | δοῦλος, φέρειν ἦν τῆσδε καὶ μείζω χάριν and (for χάρις qualified by μείζων) FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 960. C's τήνδε (*coni.* Bothe!) 'no doubt arises from the belief that καὶ had to be a copula' (Dawe, *STS* 1 173).

1372–3 οὗτος δὲ κᾶκεϊ κἀνθάδ' ὧν ἔμοιγ' ὁμῶς | ἔχθιστος ἔσται. σοὶ δὲ δρᾶν ἔξεσθ' ἅ χρῆς. 'This man, both in this world and the next, will be most hateful to me. But you can do what you want.' For ἐκεῖ of the Underworld see 690n. It contrasts with ἐνθάδε (referring to the land of the living) at *Ant.* 74–5 πλείων χρόνος | ὃν δεῖ μ' ἄρῃσκην τοῖς κάτω τῶν ἐνθάδε, Ar. *Ran.* 82 ὁ δ' εὐκολος μὲν ἐνθάδ', εὐκολος δ' ἐκεῖ; hence ὁμῶς ('equally'), not ὁμως ('nevertheless').

χρῆς for transmitted χρή is owed to Dindorf (1836) 335. As 1368 and 1370–3 make clear, Agamemnon lets Odysseus have his way without approving his course or acknowledging that it is necessary; he is unlikely to change his mind, 'especially so casually and as his very last word in the play' (MD). For the corruption see *El.* 606n., adding Rutherford's Phrynichus, pp. 133–4, Olson

on *Ar. Ach.* 778–9. Ferrari (1984) 233 claims that ἡ χρῆ is a fixed formula on the basis of *Ant.* 245–7 τὸν νεκρὸν τις ἄρτίως | θάψας βέβηκε καπτὶ χρωτὶ διψίαν | κόνιν παλύνσας κάφαγιστεύσας ἡ χρῆ. But there the Guard means that the perpetrator performed the necessary minimum of actions for a valid burial, an idea irrelevant to our passage. Contrast also Odysseus' attitude at 1378–80.

Agamemnon leaves via eisodos A, with attendants.

1374–1401 Odysseus offers yet more assistance (1376–80). Teucer refuses with politeness and grace; he retains no animus against his family's traditional foe (1381–5, 1393, 1396–9). Ajax is another matter (1393–5); and although his likely attitude can only be surmised, what the audience has seen of his character will probably encourage them to agree with Teucer's assessment. Odysseus accepts his decision without rancour and departs (1400–1). Unlike Achilles in the *Iliad*, who has Hector's corpse washed, anointed, and dressed in preparation for his burial (24.582–90; cf. Grethlein (2007) 38–9), Odysseus will have no part in his enemy's funeral. This decorous exchange brings welcome relief from the angry clashes which had dominated the play from the entry of Menelaus; yet this relief is occluded. Ajax's persistent anger shows the limits of conciliation; hatred may be stronger than reason or gratitude. And Teucer, for all his affability towards Odysseus, cannot restrain himself from yet another personal attack on the Atridae (1386–92), even though they no longer present a threat. Colloquial vocabulary suggests his coarser side (1386); while his curse recalls Ajax's proficiency in that unforgiving medium, complete with reference to the Erinys (1389–92, on which see Henrichs (1993) 168; it is little consolation to note, with Easterling (1993a) 13–14, that Teucer's curse, unlike Ajax's, is not aimed at the whole army). Like Agamemnon (1372–3), and indeed like Ajax himself (1393–5), Teucer is not inspired by Odysseus' intervention to transcend the ugly antagonism so characteristic of this drama.

1374–5 ὅστις σ', Ὀδυσσεῦ, μὴ λέγει γνῶμη σοφὸν | φῦναι, τοιοῦτον ὄντα, μῶρός ἐστ' ἀνὴρ. 'Whoever does not say that you are by nature wise in your judgment, Odysseus, being the man you are, is a fool.' For γνῶμη σοφόν cf. *Eur. El.* 52–3 γνῶμης... | τὸ σῶφρον, 296, fr. 842.1 *TrGF*, Critias 43 F 19.12 πυκνὸς τις καὶ σοφὸς γνῶμην ἀνὴρ. With τοιοῦτον ὄντα the chorus turn a pat compliment into an acknowledgement of error: only now do they see the kind of man Odysseus is.

1376–7 καὶ νῦν γε Τεύκρω τὰπὸ τοῦδ' ἀγγέλλομαι, | ὅσον τότ' ἐχθρὸς ἦ, τοσόνδ' εἶναι φίλος. 'Yes, and now I declare to Teucer that henceforth, to the extent that I was then an enemy, I am now a friend.' καὶ... γε emphasises addition (Denniston 157–8): Odysseus' position marks an advance on the one which he took in debate with Agamemnon. For adverbial τὰπὸ τοῦδ' cf. *Ant.* 889 ἀγνοῖ τοῦπὶ τήνδε τὴν κόρην, Moorhouse 151–2. The simplex

ἀγγέλλομαι (a unique middle) is used for ἐπαγγέλλομαι (ἀγγέλλω elsewhere means ‘bring news’ from or about someone or somewhere else); for this as a feature of the high style cf. *OC* 738, Radt (1976) 265 = (2002) 157–8.

In 1377 the bisected trimeter draws attention to the reversal of Odysseus’ relationship towards Ajax (Stephan (1981) 95–6 compares *OR* 419). ἦ is owed to Elmsley (1805/6 edn) for transmitted ἦν (*El.* 1023n., adding Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 992). The minority variant φίλον was an easy slip by someone assuming an accusative (rather than nominative) and infinitive construction, or else under the influence of ὅσον and τοσόνδε.

1378–80 καὶ τὸν θανόντα τόνδε συνθάπτειν θέλω, | καὶ ξυμπονεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ἑλλείπειν ὅσων | χρή τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἀνδράσιν πορεῖν βροτούς. ‘And I am willing to join in burying this dead man, to share in the task, and to omit no service which mortals should provide for the best of men.’ Funeral rites and offerings to the dead are mandatory for βροτοί: cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 93 ὡς νόμος βροτοῖς, 483 δαῖτες ἔννομοι βροτῶν. For συν– of assistance see 988n. For πόνος of the labour in managing a corpse cf. 1415, Eur. *Hec.* 572. The laudatory close is paralleled by *Ant.* 196–7 (Creon of Eteocles) τὰ πάντ’ ἐφαγνίσαι | ἃ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἔρχεται κάτω νεκροῖς.

ὅσων (*coni.* Porson (pre-1808a) 198) appears above the line in two manuscripts, presumably as a gloss or conjecture, not a preservation; similarly ὅσῳ, found in a late hand in L. For the genitive Elmsley (1814) 487 compares 115, *Ti.* 1121, *El.* 319, 1048; the meaningless paradosis ὅσον may have been influenced by the same word in 1377. πορεῖν (*coni.* Housman (1892) 35–6 = (1972) I 217) for transmitted πονεῖν ‘neatly relieves us of a feeble repetition of the verb “toil”’ (Diggle (2007) 157); ξυμπονεῖν assisted the corruption, as may have confusion between uncial P and N. Dawe³ approves, pointing to πορσυνῶ at 1398.

1381–2 ἀριστ’ Ὀδυσσεύ, πάντ’ ἔχω σ’ ἐπαινέσαι | λόγοισι· καὶ μ’ ἔψευσας ἐλπίδος πολύ. ‘Noble Odysseus, I have only praise for what you have said; indeed, you have considerably deceived me of my expectation.’ Teucer prefaces his refusal with fulsome praise: cf. [Aesch.] *PV* 340–2 τὰ μὲν σ’ ἐπαινῶ... | ... ἄτάρ | μηδὲν πόνει, FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 966–7. λόγ-οισι is a dative of cause (cf. *Ant.* 690–1 τὸ γὰρ σὸν ὄμμα δεινὸν ἀνδρὶ δημότῃ | λόγοις τοιοῦτοισι οἷς σὺ μὴ τέρψῃ κλύων, 177–8n.). Odysseus’ words, previously viewed as a source of slander against Ajax (148–51), have ensured his burial. Others see an instrumental dative, but such stress on Teucer’s words is pointless. According to Kamerbeek, ‘the ἐπαινεῖν of Teucer implies a certain reservation, for he does not intend to comply ἔργῳ with Odysseus’ wish’; but such a contrast, in itself ‘premature and ungraceful’ (Jebb), is hard to get out of the Greek, since ἔργῳ δ’ οὐκ ἔχω ἐπαινέσαι σέ would be an odd way of saying ‘I am not willing to involve you in the burial.’ ἔψευσας too highlights the

contrast with the old view of Ajax's antagonist: 'the proverbially duplicitous Odysseus has once again deceived *by being honest*' (Hesk (2003) 378). For ἔλπις of an evil expectation see 606–607/8n. For ψεύδω, ψεύδομαι with genitive ἐλπίδος cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 870, Hdt. 1.141.2, Lys. [2.27].

1383–4 τούτῳ γὰρ ὦν ἐχθιστος Ἀργείων ἀνὴρ | μόνος παρέστης χερσίν 'For although you were to him the most hateful man among the Argives, you alone stood by him with effective aid.' μόνος is now a term of praise (1273–6n.); contrast 29–31n. For παρίσταμαι in contexts of assistance see 92n. χερσίν picks up λόγοισι in 1382 (for the opposition see 1069–70n.), emphasising that Odysseus has put his words into action. Its use here (despite Teucer's later refusal of Odysseus' active involvement in the burial) may be intended 'to appease Odysseus by suggesting that he has already *done enough*' (MD).

1384–5 οὐδ' ἔτλης παρών | θανόντι τῷδε ζῶν ἐφυβρίσαι μέγα 'and you did not bring yourself, a living man, to stand there and heap insults on the dead in his presence'. For τλῆναι 'steel one's heart to crime' see *El.* 273n. The wickedness of insulting the dead (988–9n.) is amplified when the crime occurs in the dead man's presence (hence παρών: 337–8n.); juxtaposition of terms for life and death (1127n.) accentuates the cowardly nature of the action. (Contrast the principle enunciated in Thuc. 2.45.1 φθόνος γὰρ τοῖς ζῶσι πρὸς τὸ ἀντίπαλον, τὸ δὲ μὴ ἐμποδῶν ἀνανταγωνίστω εὐνοίᾳ τετίμηται or Dem. 18.315 τοῖς μὲν ζῶσι πᾶσιν ὕπεστί τις ἢ πλείων ἢ ἐλάττων φθόνος, τοὺς τεθνεώτας δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν ἐχθρῶν οὐδεὶς ἔτι μισεῖ, where see Wankel.)

1386–8 ὡς ὁ στρατηγὸς οὐπιβρόντητος μολῶν | αὐτὸς τε χῶ ξύναιμος ἠθελησάτην | [λωβητὸν αὐτὸν ἐκβαλεῖν ταφῆς ἄτερ]. 'as the crazy general who came along, he and his brother, wanted to [cast him out, disfigured, without burial].' Nauck⁶ p. 197 deletes 1388, a line with two faults. (i) ἠθελησάτην would have to stand for ἔτλησαν, ἐθέλοντες (giving the cumbersome '... just as the Atreidae dared, wanting to...'), but no good parallel has been adduced. Jebb compares Pl. *Symp.* 179de ἐποίησαν τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ γυναικῶν γενέσθαι, οὐχ ὥσπερ Ἀχιλλέα τὸν τῆς Θέτιδος ὕδον ἐτίμησαν (understand τιμῶν after οὐχ, from ἐτίμησαν) and *Gorg.* 522a; further examples at K–G II 575, including Eur. *Ba.* 928–9 ἀλλ' ἐξ ἔδρας σοι πλόκαμος ἐξέστηχ' ὅδε, | οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ νιν ὑπὸ μίτρᾳ καθήρμοσα (understand καθηρμοσμένος: thus Rijksbaron (1991) 120). But understanding a participle from a main verb in a negative subordinate clause is quite different from splitting a finite verb in a subordinate clause into two new units: another finite verb, with the same sense as the verb in the main clause, and a participle, the sense taken from the original finite verb. By contrast, ὡς... ἠθελησάτην is syntactically complete and clear.

(ii) The similarity between 1388 and 1392 is striking: λωβητὸν ~ λώβαις, ἐκβαλεῖν ~ ἐκβαλεῖν, αὐτὸν ~ τὸν ἄνδρα, ταφῆς ἄτερ ~ ἀναξίως. Correlation this close cannot be explained by invoking ancient indifference to repetition. Rather, 1392 was quarried by an interpolator who wanted to give ἡθελησάτην an infinitive, and did not notice that it went with ἐφυβρίσαι understood.

ὁ στρατηγός is almost immediately picked up and expanded by αὐτός τε χῶ ξύναιμος: cf. *OC* 461–2, 557–9, 1124–5, *Phil.* 88–9, *Hom. Hym.* 2.1–2. ἐπιβρόντητος is *hapax*, but ἐμβρόντητος is a common insult in comedy (*Ar. Eccl.* 793, *Philemon* fr. 45.3 *PCG*, *Ophelion* fr. 3.2 (sense unclear), *Com. Adesp.* fr. 1014.42, *Men. Dysc.* 441, *Peric.* 523; also *Sam.* 411 ἐμβροντησία, *Col.* 63, *Georg.* fr. 4.1 Sandbach ἐμβροβρόντησαι), and found in oratory at *Dem.* 18.243. The term queries the addressee's judgment in a colloquial manner, like the English 'crazy' (cf. [Pl.] *Alc.* 2 140c τοὺς μὲν πλείστον αὐτῆς [*sc.* ἀφροσύνης] μέρος ἔχοντας μαινομένους καλοῦμεν, τοὺς δ' ὀλίγον ἔλαττον ἡλιθίους τε καὶ ἐμβροντήτους, *Hippocr. Vict.* 35 τούτους ἥδη οἱ μὲν ἄφρονες ὀνομάζουσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐμβροντήτους). The idiom presumably arises from the idea that people struck by lightning can have their wits confused: cf. *Xen. An.* 3.4.12 Ζεὺς δ' ἐμβροντήτους ποιεῖ [*v.l.* δὲ βροντῇ κατέπληξε] τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας and (for the impact of lightning on the φρένες) [*Aesch.*] *PV* 361–2 (of Typhon struck by Zeus) φρένας γὰρ εἰς αὐτὰς τυπείς | ἐφεψαλώθη κάξεβροντήθη σθένος, *Archil.* fr. 120.2 *IEG* οἶνω συγκεραυνωθείς φρένας, *Ritenour et al.* (2008) 590 (on the long-term neurological impact of lightning strikes). For ἐκβαλεῖν see 1064–5n.

1389–91 τοιγάρ σφ' Ὀλύμπου τοῦδ' ὁ πρεσβέων πατήρ | μνήμων τ' Ἐρινὺς καὶ τελεσφόρος Δίκη | κακοὺς κακῶς φθείρειαν 'Therefore may the father who rules over this Olympus, the remembering Erinys, and Justice which brings accomplishment, wretchedly destroy the wretches.' For τοιγάρ see 666–7n. Ὀλυμπος denotes the sky, not the mountain: cf. *Ant.* 758 ἀλλ' οὐ, τόνδ' Ὀλυμπον, ἴσθ' ὅτι, κτλ., *OC* 1654–5 (without the demonstrative) γῆν τε προσκυνοῦνθ' ἅμα | καὶ τὸν θεῶν Ὀλυμπον, *Eur.* fr. 114.5 *TrGF*, and *Anghe-lina* (2008) 428–32 for conflation of the two in epic. Olympian Zeus is invoked in a curse at *Theogn.* 851 Ζεὺς ἄνδρ' ἐξολέσειεν Ὀλύμπιος.

For μνήμων of the Erinys cf. [*Aesch.*] *PV* 516 μνήμονες . . . Ἐρινύες, *Aesch. Eum.* 382–3 κακῶν | . . . μνάμονες: 'regardless of how much time has elapsed since a wrong was done, the Erinyes remember it and will punish it' (Sommerstein on the latter). τελεσφόρος Δίκη also expresses the idea that justice is accomplished in the end: cf. *Hes. Op.* 217–18 δίκη δ' ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει | ἐς τέλος ἐξελθοῦσα, *Aesch. Ag.* 782 (Δίκα) πᾶν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα νωμᾷ, 1432–3 μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς Δίκην | Ἄτην Ἐρινύν τε, *Eum.* 243 τέλος δίκης, 539–44 βωμὸν αἶδεσαι Δίκας . . . κύριον μένει τέλος, *Cho.* 306–11.

Dike and the Erinys are associated at *Tr.* 808–9 ὦν σε ποίνιμος Δίκη | τίσειαι τ' Ἐρινὺς τε, *Aesch. Ag.* 1432–3, *Eum.* 511–12 ὦ Δίκα, | ὦ θρόνοι τ'

Ἐρινύων (also Dike and Moira at *Ag.* 1535–6, the latter often associated with the Erinyes: see Fraenkel). Zeus' connexions with Dike (*OC* 1381–2, West on Hes. *Op.* 259) and the Erinyes (*Ag.* 55–9, Winnington-Ingram (1983a) 154–74) are well known. τελεσφόρος might have been predicated of any of the trio, since τέλειος is applied to Zeus (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 973) and the Erinyes (*Eum.* 382).

For the orthography of Ἐρινύς see 835–7n. For κακῶς and the polyptoton κακοὺς κακῶς in curses see respectively *A/O* on Ar. *Thesm.* 349–51 and [839–42]n.

1391–2 ὥσπερ ἤθελον | τὸν ἄνδρα λῶβαις ἐκβαλεῖν ἀναξίως. 'just as they wanted to cast out the man outrageously, contrary to what he deserved.' Instead of τὸν Bentley (pre-1742) 245 conjectures τόνδ' (for the corruption see 1097–8n.; Dobree (pre-1825) II 45 attributes this to 'Bandinellus, nescio unde'), which could be right. For ἐκβαλεῖν see 1064–5n.

1393–5 σὲ δ', ὦ γεραίου σπέρμα Λαέρτου πατρός, | τάφου μὲν ὀκνῶ τοῦδ' ἐπιψαύειν ἔαν, | μὴ τῷ θανόντι τοῦτο δυσχερὲς ποιῶ. 'But, o seed of your old father Laertes, I hesitate to allow you to touch this burial, in case my action is repulsive to the dead man.' In the *Odyssey* the dead Ajax refuses to speak to his old enemy Odysseus, despite the latter's conciliatory tone (11.543–64). For the persistence of strong emotion after death cf. *El.* 432–48, Ant. Sid. *A.P.* 7.30.5–6 = 280–1 *HE*, Antiphanes *A.P.* 9.294.5–6 = 1021–2 *GP* τί τοσόνδε καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσιν ἀπεχθής | Πέρσαις; (asked of Leonidas), Philip *A.P.* 7.405.5 = 2865 *GP* ὅς οὐδ' ἐν Αἰδῇ νῦν κεκοίμηκεν χόλον (of Hipponax).

Teucer's elaborate address softens his refusal. σπέρμα with the father's name is a high-style tragic vocative (*El.* [1508]n.). The reference to Odysseus' father Laertes as it were rejects the insulting ascription of his paternity to Sisyphus (188–90n.; thus Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 321); a related idea is explicit at *Phil.* 1310–12 (Philoctetes to Neoptolemus) τὴν φύσιν δ' ἔδειξας, ὦ τέκνον, | ἐξ ἧς ἐβλαστες, οὐχὶ Σισύφου πατρός, | ἀλλ' ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως. For the forms of the name Laertes see 1–2n. Both Λαέρτου and Λαρτίου are metrically possible, but the former is much better attested. As at 380, Λαρτίου is found in Triclinius's text as well as a fifteenth-century manuscript usually unaffiliated with Triclinius. I suspect Triclinian emendation, right in 380, unnecessary (but possible) here.

ποιῶ shows metrical shortening in the first syllable (Sjölund (1938) 37); the variant ποῶ is not Attic (cf. Thraette 1 320).

1396–7 τὰ δ' ἄλλα καὶ ξύμπρασσε, κεῖ τινα στρατοῦ | θέλεις κομίζειν, οὐδὲν ἄλγος ἔξομεν. 'As for the rest, do indeed give assistance, and if you want to bring anyone from the army, we will not be aggrieved.' καί gives assent to Odysseus' original request at 1378–80 (cf. Denniston 321–3), just as ξυμ– picks up Odysseus' repeated use of the prefix there, an effect removed by σύ πρᾶσσε

(*coni.* Blaydes¹). ξύμπρασσε (*coni.* Brunck) for transmitted ξύμπραττε removes the distinctively Attic-Boeotian form which tragedy avoids (same corruption at *El.* 998, 1026, 1465, *OR* 772 (perhaps), *Ant.* 63, 564, 997, 1089, *Tr.* 1156, *Phil.* 1449). ἐξομεν becomes ἄξομεν in F via a common corruption (62–4n.); Dawe, *STS* 1 173, is too patient with the error. Deleting these lines (thus Schneidewin¹ and (1849) 476–7) yields an impossible connexion between 1395 and 1398 (thus Łazarewicz (1856) 25). Having told Odysseus that he cannot participate in the burial, Teucer might say ‘No, I will do everything’, but not ‘I will do everything *else*.’ Moreover, the statement has an important rhetorical function, softening the refusal by vaguely suggesting some alternative way in which Odysseus could show his respects (thus Boeckh *ap.* Łazarewicz).

1398–9 ἐγὼ δὲ τᾶλλα πάντα πορσυνῶ· σὺ δὲ | ἀνὴρ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐσθλὸς ὧν ἐπίστασο. ‘I will provide everything else. But you should be aware that you have been a noble man to us.’ τᾶλλα πάντα denotes everything connected with the burial not included in τὰ... ἄλλα (1396); that is, the proximate involvement in the burial referred to at 1393–4. Rauchenstein’s τὰμά (for the error see *El.* 337n.) removes what seems an awkward repetition, but ancient tolerance of iteration was higher than our own (*El.* 335–6n.), and the possessive (‘this is my business, not yours’) would be tactless. (The first appearance of the conjecture which I have found is in Wolff², but in 1871 Nauck⁶ p. 197 attributes it to Rauchenstein, who at (1873) 588 refers to it as his ‘earlier suggestion’, and asserts that Wolff ‘also’ writes it.) If conjecture is needed, τᾶλλείποντα (*coni.* Housman (1892) 36 = (1972) 1217, comparing 1379) is more plausible. καθ’ ἡμᾶς in this sense (cf. Eur. *Andr.* 740–1 κἄν... τὸ λοιπὸν ἦ | σώφρων καθ’ ἡμᾶς; also *S. El.* 24 ἐσθλὸς εἰς ἡμᾶς γεγώς) is marginally preferable to the alternative ‘in our eyes’ (cf. Eur. *IA* 1440 κατ’ ἐμὲ δ’ εὐκλεῆς ἔσση), since it emphasises the (unexpected) beneficiaries of Odysseus’ nobility.

1400–1 ἀλλ’ ἤθελον μὲν· εἰ δὲ μή ὅτι σοι φίλον | πρᾶσσειν τάδ’ ἡμᾶς, εἴμ’ ἐπαινέσας τὸ σόν. ‘Well, I was willing. But if you are not keen that I should do this, I will accept your decision and go.’ Odysseus’ words, and his immediate, separate departure, indicate that he plays no part in the burial. His refusal to accept a subordinate role in the ceremony is polite and to the point; he does not complain, as he could have done, that there would be no burial were it not for him. According to Easterling (1993a) 14, ‘there is nothing to indicate that he and some unspecified number of soldiers will not do as Teucer suggests and witness the funeral when the time comes’, but this supposes a change of mind on his part after the end of the play.

Odysseus leaves via eisodos A.

1402–20 Teucer’s concluding anapaests (cf. *Phil.* 1445–68) give instructions in preparation for Ajax’s burial. The long delay since Ajax’s suicide, and

his eagerness to begin the rite, adequately explain his emphasis on haste (1402–4, 1413–15); there is no indication that ‘he is apparently not confident that Odysseus’ intervention has completely removed the threat from Ajax’s enemies’ (H/OK (2007) 376; contrast Hom. *Il.* 24.799–800). The heart of the piece lies in his address to Eurysaces (1409–13), which movingly refers to the son’s affection for his father, yet simultaneously implies the continued fearsomeness of Ajax and his corpse.

Dawe, *STS* 1 173–5, suspects this passage, and deletes it in his third edition. Individual lines and sections were first deleted as follows: 1402–3 (ἦδη... χρόνος) Nauck⁴; 1403–8 Nauck⁵ p. 192; 1402–13 (ἦδη... μένος) Nauck⁸; 1416 Bentley (pre-1742) 245; 1417 Dindorf (1825 edn p. lvii); 1418–20 Ritter (1861) 428–30. (Łazarewicz (1856) 26–7 does not delete 1413–17, *pace* Dawe³.) I accept the deletion of 1416–17, while 1418–20 are, as Dawe writes, a separate problem. In 1402–15, Dawe, *STS*, objects to transitive ταχύνετε (1404), τοί (1404), the sense of γάρ (1411), and βάτω following σοῦσθω; in his apparatus he also objects to γε (1409). I attempt to deal with his objections in the several passages.

1402–3 ἄλις· ἦδη γάρ πολὺς ἐκτέταται | χρόνος. ‘Enough – for already much time has been drawn out.’ For ἄλις in drama with this sense cf. Eur. fr. 792a.1 *TrGF* ἄλις, ὧ βιοτά, *Hel.* 1581 ἄλις μοι, Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1656 and 1659, Collard (2005a) 367. ἐκτείνω with χρόνος is paralleled by (ἐκ)τείνω βίον at Eur. *Med.* 670, *Suppl.* 1109, fr. 472.9 *TrGF*, [Aesch.] *PV* 537, Eur. *Ion* 625 (αἰῶνα); cf. also Aesch. *Pers.* 64 τείνοντα χρόνον τρομέονται. Hence we can reject λόγος (*coni.* Morstadt (1863) 26), for which cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 916 μακρὰν γὰρ ἐξέτεινας (adding *Cho.* 510).

1403–4 ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν κοίλην κάπετον | χερσὶ ταχύνετε ‘But some men quickly ready a hollow trench with your hands’. For the κοίλην κάπετον see 1164–6n.; χερσὶ indicates that, unlike Teucer in that passage, the men are going to dig the trench themselves (Renehan (1992) 352). κάπετον... ταχύνετε ‘hurry the trench’ is defended by Renehan as a natural (perhaps colloquial?) expression; usually intransitive, the verb takes an accusative of the person hurried at Eur. *Alc.* 256–7. The scholium μετὰ σπουδῆς ὀρύξατε (p. 257 Chr.) may have glossed a text reading ταχύνατε (MLW).

1404–6 τοῖ δ’ ὑψίβατον | τρίποδ’ ἀμφίπυρον λουτρῶν ὁσίων | θέσθ’ ἐπικάειρον: ‘while others place ready a tall cauldron with fire set around it, suitable for the holy water.’ Corpses were washed before burial (654–6n.). τοί (= οἱ) is attested in Aesch. *Pers.* 424, 568, 584, *Sept.* 295, 298, Eur. *Andr.* 284 (the first from trimeters, the rest from lyric), and possibly at Aesch. *Pers.* 18–19 (anapaests; *coni.*) and S. fr. 555b.20 *TrGF* (trimeters) νῦν δὲ σκολῆς ἕκατ’ τοῖ μ., where Hunt (1927b) 35 writes τοῖ μέ[v; the following line contains a plural

participle, which is consistent with pronominal τοί. The papyrus punctuates after ἔκσσι, which suggests that its scribe took τοί as somehow separate from the preceding word, even if it did not actually begin a new sentence. (LI-J/W, *So.* cite Carden (1974) 105 in support of their proposition that this fragment does not provide a certain instance of pronominal τοί, but Carden raises no objections beyond the rarity of the form.) Even if we presume no Sophoclean parallel, the Aeschylean instances are enough to support pronominal τοί here; we must turn to Aeschylus to justify ῥα (another primarily epic usage), for example (172–5n.; cf. Jebb's edition, p. lii).

For ἀμφίπυρον cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.426 ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ πυρὶ χαλκὸν ἰήνατε, *Il.* 18.344 = *Od.* 8.434 ἀμφὶ πυρὶ στῆσαι τρίποδα μέγαν, *Il.* 18.348 = *Od.* 8.437 γάστρην μὲν τρίποδος πῦρ ἄμφεπε, *Il.* 23.702 τρίποδ' ἔμπυριβήτην (the *Iliad* 18 passage describes the washing of Patroclus' body). For ἐπικάριον see Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.270(c) ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος.

1407–8 μία δ' ἐκ κλισίας ἀνδρῶν ἴλη | τὸν ὑπασπίδιον κόσμον φερέτω. 'Let one company of men bring his body-armour out of the hut.' Ajax's armour will be buried with him (577), apart from his shield (574–6). For ἴλη of a body of men cf. fr. 617a *TGF*, Eur. *Alc.* 581 (transferred to lions), Pind. *N.* 5.38 εὔφρονες ἴλαι, Hdt. 1.73.3, 1.202.2, Xen. *An.* 1.2.16, Call. *Hym.* 5.33 (maidens); also ἰλαδόν at Hom. *Il.* 2.93, Hes. *Op.* 287, perhaps Tyrnt. fr. 23.13 *IEG* ἴλη[δόν, Hdt. 1.172.1. [Eur.] *Rhes.* 740 τὸν ὑπασπίδιον κοῖτον may be borrowed from this passage (thus Fries); the word is epic (Hom. *Il.* 13.158, 13.807, 16.609, Asius fr. 13.7 *GEF*), but with a different sense ('under the protection of one's shield'). For κόσμος of a soldier's armour cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 397.

1409–11 παῖ, σὺ δὲ πατρός γ', ὅσον ἰσχύεις, | φιλότῃτι θιγῶν πλευράς σὺν ἐμοὶ | τάσδ' ἐπικούφιζ'. 'Boy, you hold on with loving care to the sides of your father with all your strength, and lift him with me.' Ajax's wish for his corpse to be raised (827–8) is at last fulfilled. For σὺ δέ after a vocative see *El.* 150n. δέ... γε signals the move to a new addressee (cf. *El.* 1367 σφῶν δ' ἐννέπω γε, Denniston 155–6). τόσον (*coni.* Wecklein⁶ or earlier) introduces a form with restricted distribution in tragedy (277n.), Hartung's ὦ παῖ, σὺ πατρός δ' puts δέ in a less idiomatic position and does not motivate the corruption, while Triclinius's σὺ δὲ παῖ τοῦ πατρός yields four consecutive short syllables, a very rare sequence in tragedy (Diggle (1981a) 45 and West (1982) 95 cite no Sophoclean cases). For feminine πλευράς see 1253–4n.

1411–13 ἔτι γὰρ θερμαὶ | σύριγγες ἄνω φυσῶσι μέλαν | μένος. 'For still the warm channels are spouting upwards the black force.' γὰρ explains φιλότῃτι θιγῶν (thus Campbell): the still-bleeding corpse requires special care by its bearers. Hence we do not need to write τοί for γὰρ (*coni.* Dawe (1968) 13–14). Although a real body would no longer be emitting blood so long after the

death, the macabre description irrationally suggests on a physiological level the enduring menace of the dead Ajax, which Teucer had implied in a different context at 1393–5. The choice of noun may also recall Odysseus’ concluding plea δάμασσον δὲ μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμόν at *Od.* 11.562, which Ajax rejects: his μένος will not be sated.

Freshly spilt blood is ‘still warm’ at Hom. *Il.* 11.266 ὄφρ’ οἱ αἶμ’ ἔτι θερμόν ἀνήνοθεν ἐξ ὠτειλῆς; cf. Diggle (2006) 98. σύριγξ denotes anything hollow, like a pipe (*El.* 721n.): e.g. nostrils (cf. [918–19]), arteries/veins (cf. Ap. Rh. 4.1647 σύριγξ αἱματόεσσα κατὰ σφυρόν, Skoda (1983) 385), or breathing tubes. Since contemporary respiratory theory often assumed that blood and air travelled in the same tubes (Platt (1911) 30–1, Finglass (2009f) 336–7 n. 8), it is a mistake to distinguish these senses. The alternative ‘jets of blood’ (*Σ* p. 259 Chr. ἀναδόσεις τοῦ αἵματος; cf. Hom. *Od.* 22.18, cited [918–19]n., and Enn. *Ajax* 14. Jocelyn *misso sanguine tepido tullii efflantes volant*) produces obviously absurd physiology and impossible staging.

For μέλαν μένος of blood cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1067 αἱματηρόν . . . μένος; perhaps also λευκ]όν μένος (of sperm) at Archil. fr. 196a.52 *IEG*, Dioscorides *A.P.* 5.55.7 = 1489 *HE*. For black blood see 374–6n. Padel (1992) 25 with n. 54 compares Hom. *Il.* 17.297–8 ἐγκέφαλος δὲ παρ’ αὐλὸν ἀνέδραμεν ἐξ ὠτειλῆς | αἱματόεις. τοῦ δ’ αὖθι λύθη μένος.

1413–14 ἀλλ’ ἄγε πᾶς, φίλος ὅστις ἀνὴρ | φησὶ παρεῖναι, σούσθω, βάτω ‘But come, every man who claims to be present as a friend, let him hurry, let him get on his way’. Teucer addresses those present: ‘if you claim to love Ajax, now is the time to show it’. There is no general invitation to the army to participate, any more than at 1396–7 (n.). For ἀλλά introducing an imperative see n. on 194a. For examples of the ‘active’ sense of φίλος (‘amicably disposed’) see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 954. For the imperatives in asyndeton see 811n. For the absolute use of the aorist imperative of βαίνω FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 191 compare *Phil.* 1196, *OC* 1491/2, Eur. *Hel.* 1341.

1415 τῷδ’ ἀνδρὶ πονῶν τῷ πάντ’ ἀγαθῷ ‘as he labours on behalf of this man, who was noble in every way’. For πάντα strengthening adjectives see 911–12n. For πόνος of the labour in managing a corpse, and the accompaniment of the verb by a dative, see 1378–80n. and 1366n. respectively.

[1416–17 κούδενί πω λῶνι θνητῶν | Αἴαντος, ὅτ’ ἦν, τότε φωνῶ.] ‘and never yet for a better man among mortals than Ajax – when he was alive, it is of then that I speak.’ The problems of these lines are as follows. (i) ‘Two paroemiacs [218–20n.] cannot appear consecutively in recitative’ (L. Parker (1958) 86). (ii) There is no certain parallel in paroemiacs for the division — — — | — — — — ||, such as we find in 1416 (Parker). (By contrast, the overlap of the diaeresis by more than one short syllable in 1416 is permissible:

218–20n.) (iii) The construction of the datives in 1416 is unclear. We can hardly understand πονήσας from πονῶν in 1415. πῶ can mean ‘never’ rather than ‘never yet’ (644–5n.), but that does not solve the difficulty. (iv) “‘Never having worked for a better man than Ajax, – I speak of the time when he lived” means nothing unless it implies “but I have worked for a better man since he died”, which, in the context, is nonsense’ (Parker). Contrast Eur. fr. 310.1 *TrGF* ἦσθ’ εἰς θεοῦς μὲν εὐσεβής, ὅτ’ ἦσθ’, ἀεὶ, where ὅτ’ ἦσθ’ has a pathetic force in the mouth of Bellerophon addressing his ψυχὴ shortly before his death; for the phrase elsewhere cf. Meleager *A.P.* 12.33.1 = 4480 *HE* ἦν καλὸς Ἡράκλειτος ὅτ’ ἦν ποτε, *A.P.* 12.128.5 = 4474 *HE*.

Attempts to remedy these faults have not been successful. (i–ii) Jebb’s appendix (pp. 239–40) assembles conjectures, none convincing, aimed at turning 1416 into a full dimeter. Seyffert’s λῳῶνι (cf. Bothe’s text at *Phil.* 1100/1) removes the caesura (unparalleled for S., as Parker notes). Deleting 1416 leaves Αἴαντος without a construction. (Αἴαντι in **r** will be an unmetrical emendation aimed at putting Ajax into the dative case used to refer to him in 1415–16, not a trace of a better text.) (iv) Segal (1995) 218 n. 3 prints τόδε (*coni.* Jaeger (1811) 174; for the corruption see 770–3n.), but his translation ‘(Make haste) toiling for this man, noble in every way – no one of mortals grander [than Ajax when he was, I call this out]’ does not encourage.

Whether the lines are interpolated or heavily corrupt is unclear. I have deleted them on the subjective ground that no amount of emendation seems likely to raise them above the level of doggerel. Since the anapaests need a concluding paroemiac, I have indicated a lacuna after 1415; 1416–17 will have displaced the true conclusion to Teucer’s speech. The missing text could be longer than one line.

1418–20 ἡ πολλὰ βροτοῖς ἔστιν ἰδοῦσιν | γυνῶναι· πρὶν ἰδεῖν δ’ οὐδεὶς μάντις | τῶν μελλόντων ὃ τι πράξει. ‘Many are the things that men can judge when they see them. But before he sees, no man is a prophet of how he will fare in the future.’ The closing choral anapaests are similar to *Tereus* fr. 590 *TrGF*, almost certainly the end of the play: θνητὴν δὲ φύσιν χρὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν [Grotius: θνητὰ φρ. χ. θνητὴν φ. codd.], | τοῦτο κατειδόμενος ὥς οὐκ ἔστιν | πλὴν Διὸς οὐδεὶς τῶν μελλόντων | ταμίας ὃ τι χρή τετελέσθαι. In each case, ‘τῶν μελλόντων is a loose genitive of connexion, and the phrase is incomplete without the subordinate clause’ (Pearson, comparing Thuc. 1.61.1 ἦλθε... ἡ ἀγγελία τῶν πόλεων ὅτι ἀφυστᾶσι; cf. also *Ant.* 1160 μάντις οὐδεὶς τῶν καθεστῶτων βροτοῖς). The general sense of the tailpiece would be suitable for almost any Greek drama, but that is not a reason for adopting Ritter’s deletion (1402–20n.); for the style of such endings see Roberts (1987).

For δέ preceded by two words see 116–17n. Some manuscripts give the unmetrical πρὶν δ’ ἰδεῖν, putting δ’ in its more familiar second position; for

the error see FJ/W on Aesch. *Suppl.* 181, 321. For δ τι standing for $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ (the only linguistic problem alleged by Ritter) cf. *OR* 73–4 καὶ μ' ἤμαρ ἤδη *συμμετρούμενον χρόνον* | *λυπεῖ τί πράσσει* ('not "what he is doing" but "how he is getting on"': Dawe).

Conclusion Teucer, Tecmessa (with attendants), and Eurysaces leave via eisodos A, carrying the body of Ajax. Part of the chorus leave via each eisodos. At 1403–8 Teucer orders three groups to perform three tasks: to dig a trench, boil some water, and fetch Ajax's armour. He identifies the first two groups by plural pronouns and imperatives, the last as an *ἀνδρῶν ἵλη*. The first and third tasks are jobs for men, as probably is the second. The first task requires an exit via eisodos A (since it was in that direction that Teucer originally scouted for a suitable burial-place), the third via eisodos B (to bring the armour from the hut, *ἐκ κλισίας*); either direction allows fulfilment of the second (since it requires only water, fire, and a tripod). As a result, some of the chorus leave via one eisodos, some via the other. They may have split 8–7, as at 814, or, say, 10–5, with the smaller number accompanying the actors; the latter would provide an equally balanced exit. It is preferable, as H/OK (2007) 376 argue, for the departure to take place now, cued by Teucer's *ἄγε πᾶς . . . σοῦσθω*, βᾶτω, rather than at 1403–8 (as otherwise these additional imperatives would be otiose).

Both Teucer and Eurysaces assist in lifting Ajax's body (1409–11). Eurysaces can hardly take one end of the body on his own; for while this would be practically possible (the dummy being made out of light wood), it would be inappropriate in the light of the emphasis on Ajax's great size. Tecmessa or her attendants probably assist him; whether or not she lifts it, she certainly accompanies the body, thus remaining to the end a participant in the family's grief (thus Easterling (1996) 179, modifying Segal (1996) 161). Teucer leads the way towards the exit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ABBREVIATIONS: REFERENCE WORKS

- A–B C. F. L. Austin and G. Bastianini (eds.), *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia* (Biblioteca Classica 3; Milan 2002).
- ARV² J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*², 3 vols. (Oxford 1963). [1st edn 1942]
- CA J. U. Powell (ed.), *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford 1925).
- CCCA M. J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque*, 7 vols. (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire Romain 5; Leiden, New York, Copenhagen, Cologne 1977–89).
- CEG P. A. Hansen (ed.), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vols. (Texte und Kommentare 12, 15; Berlin and New York 1983–9).
- CPG E. L. von Leutsch and F. W. Schneidewin (eds.), *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, 2 vols. (Göttingen 1839–51).
- DAGM E. Pöhlmann and M. L. West (eds.), *Documents of Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford 2001).
- DELG P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*² (Paris 1999). [1st edn 1968–80]
- Denniston J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*², rev. K. J. Dover (Oxford 1954). [1st edn 1934]
- DGE F. R. Adrados *et al.*, *Diccionario Griego-Español*, 6 vols. to date (Madrid 1980–).
- D–K H. Diels (ed.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*⁶, 3 vols., rev. W. Kranz (Berlin 1951–2).
- EG G. Kaibel (ed.), *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta* (Berlin 1878).
- EGM R. L. Fowler (ed.), *Early Greek Mythography* (1 vol. to date; Oxford 2000–).
- FD III/2 *Fouilles de Delphes. Tome III. Épigraphie. Deuxième Fascicule. Inscriptions du Trésor des Athéniens* (Paris 1909–13).
- FGE D. L. Page (ed.), *Further Greek Epigrams*, revised and prepared for publication by R. D. Dawe and J. Diggle (Cambridge 1981).
- FGrHist F. Jacoby *et al.* (eds.) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Leiden, Boston, Cologne 1923–).
- FHG K. Müller and T. Müller (eds.), *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 5 vols. (Paris 1841–73).

1. ABBREVIATIONS: REFERENCE WORKS

- GEF* M. L. West (ed.), *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Cambridge, MA and London 2003).
- GL* G. T. H. Keil (ed.), *Grammatici Latini*, 7 vols. with supplement by H. Hagen (Leipzig 1857–80).
- Goodwin W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*² (London 1889). [1st edn 1860, 1865]
- GP* A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1968).
- HE* A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1965).
- IC* M. Guarducci (ed.), *Inscriptiones Creticae*, 4 vols. (Rome 1935–50).
- IEG* M. L. West (ed.), *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*², 2 vols. (Oxford 1989–92). [1st edn 1971–2]
- IG I³* D. M. Lewis *et al.* (eds.), *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*, 3 vols. (Berlin and New York 1981–98).
- IG II-III²* J. Kirchner (ed.), *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores*, 4 vols. (Berlin 1913–40).
- IG IV/1* F. Hiller de Gaertringen (ed.), *Inscriptiones Argolidis. Fasciculus Primus. Inscriptiones Epidauri* (Berlin 1929).
- IG VII* W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Inscriptiones Megaridis et Boeotiae* (Berlin 1892).
- IG IX/1²/1* G. Klaffenbach (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graeciae Septentrionalis voluminibus VII et VIII non comprehensae. Pars I. Inscriptiones Phocidis Locridis Aetoliae Acarnaniae insularum maris Ionii. Fasciculus I. Inscriptiones Aetoliae* (Berlin 1932).
- IG IX/1²/3* *id.* *Fasciculus III. Inscriptiones Locridis Occidentalis* (Berlin 1968).
- IG XII/3* F. Hiller de Gaertringen (ed.), *Inscriptiones Insularum Maris Aegaei. Fasciculus III. Inscriptiones Symes, Teuthussae, Teli, Nisyri, Astypalaeae, Anaphes, Therae et Therasiae, Pholegandri, Cimoli, Meli* (Berlin 1898, with a *Supplementum*, 1904).
- IG XII/6* K. Hallof and A. P. Matthaiou (eds.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegaei praeter Delum. Fasciculus VI. Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassii Icariaque*, 2 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 2000–).
- IG XII/9* E. Ziebarth (ed.), *Inscriptiones Insularum Maris Aegaei praeter Delum. Fasciculus Nonus. Inscriptiones Euboeae Insulae* (Berlin 1915).
- IGSK XI/1* H. Wankel (ed.), *Inchriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 11.1. Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Teil Ia* (Bonn 1979). [1b never published]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- IGSK^{xviii/1} E. Schwertheim (ed.), *Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 18. Die Inſchriften von Kyzikos und Umgebung. Teil I: Grabtexte* (Bonn 1980).
- IGSK^{xxxiii} *id.* 33. *Die Inſchriften von Hadrianoi und Hadrianeia* (Bonn 1987).
- IGSK^{lviii} A. Lajtar (ed.), *Inſchriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 58. Die Inſchriften von Byzantion*, 1 vol. to date (Bonn 2000).
- IMI¹ L. Gounaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos (eds.), *Inſcriptiones Macedoniae Inferioris (intra Bermium montem et Axium flumen repertae). Fasciculus Primus. Inſcriptiones Beroeae* (Athens 1998).
- IPri F. Hiller de Gaertringen (ed.), *Inſchriften von Priene* (Berlin 1906).
- IScM¹ D. M. Pippidi (ed.), *Inſcriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris Antiquae. Series Altera. Inſcriptiones Scythiae Minoris Graecae et Latinae. Volumen Primum. Inſcriptiones Histriae et Vicinae* (Bucharest 1983).
- IThesp P. Roesch (ed.), *Les Inſcriptions de Thespies* (prepared for publication by G. Argoud, A. Schachter, and G. Vottéro; Lyon 2007). [Online edition, available at <http://www.case.edu/artsci/clsc/asgle/corpora.html>; URL checked 20.2.11]
- K–B R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Erſter Teil: Elementar- und Formenlehre*³, 2 vols., rev. F. Blass (Hannover 1890–2).
- K–G *id.* *Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*², 2 vols., rev. B. Gerth (Hannover and Leipzig 1898–1904).
- LgrE B. Snell *et al.* (eds.), *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, 25 vols. (Göttingen 1955–2010).
- LIMC *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 8 vols. plus indexes (Zurich, Munich, and Düsseldorf 1981–99).
- Lindos II C. Blinkenberg (ed.), *Lindos. Fouilles de l'Acropole 1902–1914. II. Inſcriptions*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen and Berlin 1941).
- LS⁸ H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*⁸ (Oxford 1897).
- LSJ⁹ *id.*⁹, rev. H. Stuart-Jones *et al.* (Oxford 1940).
- M–W R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (eds.), *Fragmenta Hesiodae* (Oxford 1967).
- OLD P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford 1968–82).
- PCG R. Kassel and C. F. L. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 1983–).
- PEG A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta: Pars I*² (Stuttgart and Leipzig 1996).
- PMG D. L. Page (ed.), *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962).
- PMGF M. Davies (ed.), *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1 vol. to date (Oxford 1991–).

2. ABBREVIATIONS: SCHOLARS' NAMES

P.Oxy.	B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> , 75 vols. to date (London 1898–).
S–D	E. Schwyzler, <i>Griechische Grammatik. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik</i> , 4 vols., 2nd vol. completed by A. Debrunner (Munich 1934–71).
SEG	J. J. E. Hondius <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , 55 vols. to date (Leiden 1923–).
SH	P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and P. J. Parsons (eds.), <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> (Texte und Kommentare 11; Berlin and New York 1983).
S–M	B. Snell and H. Maehler (eds.), <i>Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis</i> , 2 vols. (Leipzig 1987–9) and <i>Bacchylides</i> (Leipzig 1970).
Threatte	L. Threatte, <i>The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions</i> , 2 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 1980–).
TLL	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i> (Leipzig 1900–).
TrGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> . Vol. 1 <i>Didascaliae Tragicae, Catalogi Tragicorum et Tragoediarum, Testimonia et Fragmenta Tragicorum Minorum</i> (ed. B. Snell, 2nd edn rev. R. Kannicht; Göttingen 1971 ¹ , 1986 ²); vol. 2 <i>Fragmenta Adespota</i> (eds. R. Kannicht and B. Snell; 1981); vol. 3 <i>Aeschylus</i> (ed. S. L. Radt; 1985); vol. 4 <i>Sophocles</i> (ed. S. L. Radt; 1977 ¹ , 1999 ²); vol. 5 <i>Euripides</i> (ed. R. Kannicht; 2 parts; 2004).
TrGFs	J. Diggle (ed.), <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta</i> (Oxford 1998).
W–H	C. Wachsmuth and O. Hense (eds.), <i>Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium</i> , 5 vols. (Berlin 1884–1912).

2. ABBREVIATIONS: SCHOLARS' NAMES

A/O	C. F. L. Austin and S. D. Olson
FJ/W	H. Friis Johansen and E. Whittle
H/C	P. A. Hansen and I. C. Cunningham
H/OK	M. F. Heath and E. R. O'Kell
LJ–J/W	P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson
LMLC	L. M.–L. Coe, <i>per litteras</i>
JD	J. Diggle, <i>per litteras</i>
MD	M. Davies, unpublished commentary and <i>per litteras</i>
MDR	M. D. Reeve, <i>per litteras</i>
AHS	A. H. Sommerstein, <i>per litteras</i>
JSS	J. S. Scullion, <i>per litteras</i>
MLW	M. L. West, unpublished textual notes and <i>per litteras</i>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

3. ABBREVIATIONS: STANDARD WORKS ON SOPHOCLES

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Bruhn | E. Bruhn, <i>Sophokles. Erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck. Aches Bändchen: Anhang</i> (Berlin 1899). |
| Campbell, PS | L. Campbell, <i>Paralipomena Sophoclea. Supplementary Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Sophocles</i> (London 1907). |
| Chr. | G. A. Christodoulou (ed.), <i>Τὰ ἀρχαῖα σχόλια εἰς Αἴαντα τοῦ Σοφοκλέους</i> (Βιβλιοθήκη Σοφίας Ν. Σαριπόλου 34; Athens 1977). |
| Dawe, STS | R. D. Dawe, <i>Studies on the Text of Sophocles</i> , 3 vols. (Leiden 1973–8). |
| Dindorf | K. W. Dindorf (ed.), <i>Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias septem ex codicibus aucta et emendata. Volumen II</i> (Oxford 1852). |
| Ellendt | F. Ellendt, <i>Lexicon Sophocleum</i> ² , rev. H. Genthe (Berlin 1872). [1st edn Königsberg 1835] |
| Ll-J/W, So. | P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, <i>Sophoclea. Studies on the Text of Sophocles</i> (Oxford 1990). |
| Ll-J/W, ST | P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, <i>Sophocles. Second Thoughts</i> (Hypomnemata 100; Göttingen 1997). |
| Moorhouse | A. C. Moorhouse, <i>The Syntax of Sophocles</i> (Mnem. Suppl. 75; Leiden 1982). |
| Papageorgius | P. N. Papageorgius (ed.), <i>Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Vetera</i> (Leipzig 1888). |
| Tessier | A. Tessier (ed.), <i>Scolii metrici alla tetrade sofoclea</i> (Hellenica 16; Alessandria 2005) |

4. EDITIONS OF SOPHOCLES' *AJAX*

- Aldine (Venice 1502).
 A. Turnebus (Paris 1553).
 J. Camerarius (Hagenau 1534 (text), Basel 1556 (commentary)).
 H. Stephanus (Geneva 1568).¹
 W. Canter (Antwerp 1579).
 T(homas) Johnson (Oxford 1705).
 Anonymous (London 1722).
 J. Tweedie (revision of Johnson; Eton 1775).²
 J. Capperonnier and J.-F. Vauvilliers (Paris 1781).

¹ Also contains Camerarius's commentary and translation.

² The preface is signed 'J. T.'. Harwood (1790) 18 identifies the editor as 'Tweedie, a Scotchman'.

4. EDITIONS OF SOPHOCLES' *AJAX*

- R. F. P. Brunck (Strasbourg 1786¹, 1786–9², 1788³).³
 S. Musgrave (Oxford 1800).⁴
 P. Elmsley (Edinburgh 1805/6).⁵
 F. H. Bothe (Leipzig and London 1806¹, Leipzig 1826²).
 C. A. Lobeck (Leipzig 1809¹, 1835², Berlin 1866³).⁶
 G. H. Schaefer (Leipzig 1810).
 C. G. A. Erfurdt (Leipzig 1811).
 J. G. J. Hermann (Leipzig 1817¹, 1825², 1848³).
 E. Wunder (Leipzig 1824, Gotha and Erfurt 1837¹, Gotha 1845², Gotha and Erfurt 1857³).
 K. W. Dindorf (Leipzig 1825, Leipzig and London 1830¹, Oxford 1832², Oxford 1860³, Leipzig 1866⁴, Leipzig 1885⁵, revised by S. Mekler).
 F. Neue (Nevius) (Leipzig 1831).
 W. Linwood (London 1846¹, 1852², 1866³, 1877⁴).
 F. W. Schneidewin (Leipzig 1849¹, 1853², Berlin 1855³).
 J. A. Hartung (Leipzig 1851).
 T. Bergk (Leipzig 1858).
 G. A. Wolff (Leipzig 1858¹, 1867², 1874³).
 J. A. Nauck (revision of Schneidewin; Berlin 1860⁴, 1865⁵, 1867^{5a}, 1871⁶, 1877⁷, 1882⁸, 1888⁹).
 M. Seyffert (Berlin 1866).
 E. Tournier (Paris 1867¹, 1877² [n.v.]).
 R. C. Jebb (London, Oxford, Cambridge 1868, Cambridge 1896; 1907, abridged by Pearson).⁷
 L. Bellermann (revision of Wolff; Leipzig 1887⁴, 1889⁵, 1913⁶).
 R. Paehler (Gotha 1889¹, 1898², 1909³). [n.v.]
 N. Wecklein (Munich 1917⁶).
 F. H. M. Blaydes (London and Edinburgh 1875¹, Halle 1908²).
 C. E. Palmer (London 1878).
 F. A. Paley (London 1880, Cambridge 1888).
 L. Campbell (Oxford 1881).
 F(riedrich) Schubert (Prague and Leipzig 1883¹).
 L. Radermacher (revision of Schneidewin-Nauck; 1913¹⁰).

³ All references are to the first edition.

⁴ Musgrave died in 1780.

⁵ British Library, C.28.i.12. See Finglass (2007a).

⁶ Lobeck died in 1860. The 'Auctarium Adnotationum ad Soph. Ajacem' in the third edition, pp. 401–14, first appeared in Lobeck (1837) 551–68. Lobeck (1803) anticipates a few notes on lines 1–135, though nothing cited in my commentary.

⁷ References are to the 1896 edition unless otherwise indicated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A. C. Pearson (Oxford 1924).
J. C. Kamerbeek (Leiden 1953¹, 1963²).
A. Dain (Paris 1958¹, 1965²).
W. B. Stanford (London and New York 1963).
R. D. Dawe (Leipzig 1975¹, 1984², Stuttgart and Leipzig 1996³).
P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson (Oxford 1990, corrected 1992).
P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones (Cambridge, MA and London 1994, corrected 1997).
A. F. Garvie (Warminster 1998).
G. O. Hutchinson (Oxford 2001).⁸

5. TRANSLATIONS OF SOPHOCLES' *AJAX*

Many of the editions listed above also contain translations

- A. Schöll (Berlin 1842).
R. Whitelaw (London 1883).
R. C. Trevelyan (London 1919).
P. Mazon (Paris 1958¹, 1965²).⁹
P. Meineck and P. Woodruff (Indianapolis 2007).
D. A. Raeburn (London 2008).

6. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME

- Adler, A. *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. (Lexicographi Graeci 1; Leipzig 1928–38).
Alberti, J. *Hesychii Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Leiden 1746–66).
Allan, W. *Euripides*. Helen (Cambridge 2008).
Allen, T. W. *Homeri Ilias*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1931).
Alpers, K. *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros. Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe der Fragmente* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 4; Berlin and New York 1981).
Apitz, J. *Sophoclis Trachiniae* (Halle 1833).
Arnott, W. G. *Alexis. The Fragments* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 31; Cambridge 1996).
Austin, C. F. L., and Olson, S. D. *Aristophanes*. Thesmophoriazusae (Oxford 2004).
Bachmann, L. *Anecdota Graeca e codd. mss. Bibl. Reg. Parisin.*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1828).
Badham, C. Εὐριπίδου Ἰφιγένεια ἡ ἐν Ταύροις. Ἑλένη (London 1851).
Barrett, W. S. *Euripides*. Hippolytos (Oxford 1964).

⁸ 1185–1222 only; in his edition of Greek lyric poetry, in Section 6 below.

⁹ In Dain's edition.

6. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME

- Berger, H. *Die geographischen Fragmente des Eratosthenes* (Leipzig 1880).
- Bergler, S. *Aristophanis Comoediae Undecim*, 2 vols. (Leiden 1760).
- Beroutsos, D. C. *A Commentary on the 'Aspis' of Menander. Part One: Lines 1–298* (Hypomnemata 157; Göttingen 2005).
- Bethe, E., *Pollucis Onomasticon*, 3 vols. (Lexicographi Graeci 9; Leipzig 1900–37).
- Blomfield, C. J. *Aeschyli Prometheus Vincitus* (Cambridge 1810¹, 1812²).
- Bond, G. W. *Euripides. Heracles* (Oxford 1981).
- Bothe, F. H. *Aeschyli dramata quae supersunt et deperditorum fragmenta graece et latine* (Leipzig and London 1805).
- Braswell, B. K. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Texte und Kommentare 14; Berlin and New York 1988).
- A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Texte und Kommentare 19; Berlin and New York 1998).
- Brügger, C., Stoevesandt, M., and Visser, E. *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. Band II. Zweiter Gesang (B). Faszikel 2: Kommentar* (Munich and Leipzig 2003).
- Bühler, W. *Die Europa des Moschos* (Hermes Einzelschriften 13; Wiesbaden 1960).
- Zenobii Athoi proverbialia*, 3 vols. to date (Göttingen 1982–).
- Burges, G. *Euripidis Troades* (Cambridge 1807).
- Aeschyli, quae supersunt, fabulae et fragmenta. Eumenides* (London 1822).
- Caizzi, F. D. *Antisthenis Fragmenta* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 13; Milan and Varese 1966).
- Carey, C. *Lysiae Orationes cum fragmentis* (Oxford 2007).
- Chalcondylas, D. *Τὸ μὲν παρὸν βιβλίον σοῦδα . . .* (Milan 1499). [Edition of the *Suda*]
- Chantry, M. *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars III: Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas, Ranas, Ecclesiazusas et Plutum. Fasc. IVb, continens Scholia Recentiora in Aristophanis Plutum* (Groningen 1996).
- Coleman, R. *Vergil. Eclogues* (Cambridge 1977).
- Collard, C. *Euripides. Supplices*, 2 vols. (Groningen 1975).
- (transl.) *Aeschylus. Oresteia* (Oxford 2002).
- Collard, C., and Cropp, M. J. *Euripides. Fragments*, 2 vols. (Loeb Classical Library 504, 506; Cambridge, MA and London 2008).
- Cramer, J. A. *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis*, 4 vols. (Oxford 1839–41).
- Crawley, R. (transl.) *Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War* (London 1876).
- Cropp, M. J. *Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris* (Warminster 2000).
- Davies, M. *Sophocles. Trachiniae* (Oxford 1991).
- Dawe, R. D. *Sophocles. Oedipus Rex* (Cambridge 1982¹, 2006²).
- Denniston, J. D. *Euripides. Electra* (Oxford 1939).
- Denniston, J. D., and Page, D. L. *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford 1957).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Diggle, J. *Euripides*. Phaethon (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 12; Cambridge 1970).
Euripidis Fabulae, 3 vols. (Oxford 1981–94).
Theophrastus. Characters (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 43; Cambridge 2004).
- Dilts, M. R. *Scholia in Aeschinem* (Stuttgart and Leipzig 1992).
- Dindorf, L. *Xenophontis Institutio Cyri* (Oxford 1857).
- Dodds, E. R. *Euripides*. Bacchae (Oxford 1944¹, 1960²).
Plato. Gorgias (Oxford 1959).
- Dover, K. J. *Aristophanes*. Clouds (Oxford 1968).
Aristophanes. Frogs (Oxford 1993).
- Dover, *Thucydides*: see Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover.
- Dunbar, N. V. *Aristophanes*. Birds (Oxford 1995).
- Dyck, A. R. *A Commentary on Cicero*, De Officiis (Ann Arbor 1996).
- Easterling, P. E. *Sophocles*. Trachiniae (Cambridge 1982).
- Eijk, P. J. van der *Diocles of Carystus. A Collection of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary*, 2 vols. (Studies in Ancient Medicine 22–3; Leiden, Boston, Cologne 2000–1).
- Elmsley, P. *Sophoclis Oedipus Tyrannus* (Oxford 1811¹, 1825²).
Euripidis Heraclidae (Oxford 1813¹, 1828²).
Euripidis Medea (Oxford and London 1818¹, Oxford 1828²).
Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus (Oxford 1823).
- Erbse, H. *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1949 Nr. 2; Berlin 1950).
Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem, 7 vols. (Berlin 1969–88).
- Faulkner, A. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (Oxford 2008).
- Finglass, P. J. *Sophocles*. Electra (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 44; Cambridge 2007).
Pindar. Pythian Eleven (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 45; Cambridge 2007).
- Foerster, R. *Libanii Opera*, 12 vols. (Leipzig 1903–27).
- Fraenkel, E. D. M. *Aeschylus*. Agamemnon, 3 vols. (Oxford 1950).
- Fries, A. [*Euripides*], Rhesus 565–996: *Introduction and Commentary* (diss. Oxford 2008).
- Friis Johansen, H., and Whittle, E. W. *Aeschylus*. The Suppliants, 3 vols. (no place, 1980).
- Furley, W. D. *Menander*. Epitrepontes (BICS Suppl. 106; London 2009).
- Gaisford, T. *Suidae Lexicon*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1834).
Etymologicon Magnum (Oxford 1848).
- Garvie, A. F. *Aeschylus*. Choephoroi (Oxford 1986).
Aeschylus. Persae (Oxford 2009).

6. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME

- Gerber, D. E. 'Pindar, *Nemean Six*: a commentary', *HSCP* 99 (1999) 33–91.
- Gibson, R. K. *Ovid. Ars Amatoria Book 3* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 40; Cambridge 2003).
- Gomme, A. W., and Sandbach, F. H. *Menander. A Commentary* (Oxford 1973).
- Gomme, A. W., Andrewes, A., and Dover, K. J. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. iv. *Books V 25–VIII* (Oxford 1970).
- Gow, A. S. F. *Theocritus*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1950).
- Bucolici Graeci* (Oxford 1952).
- Machon. The Fragments* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 1; Cambridge 1965).
- Griffith, M. *Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge 1983).
- Sophocles. Antigone* (Cambridge 1999).
- Haffner, M. *Das Florilegium des Orion* (Palingenesia 75; Stuttgart 2001).
- Handley, E. W. *The Dyskolos of Menander* (London 1965).
- Hansen, P. A. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon. Volumen III. Π–Σ* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 11/3; Berlin and New York 2005).
- Hansen, P. A., and Cunningham, I. C. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon. Volumen IV. Τ–Ω* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 11/4; Berlin and New York 2009).
- Headlam, W. G. Agamemnon of *Aeschylus* (ed. A. C. Pearson; Cambridge 1910).
- Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments* (ed. A. D. Knox; Cambridge 1922).
- Hermann, J. G. J. *Euripidis Hecuba* (Leipzig 1800).
- Herwerden, H. van *Sophoclis Oedipus Rex. Accedunt Analecta Tragica et Anecdota Ambrosiana* (Utrecht 1866).
- Heubeck, A., and Hoekstra, A. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. II. *Books IX–XVI* (Oxford 1989).
- Heubeck, A., West, S. R., and Hainsworth, J. B. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. I. *Introduction and Books I–VIII* (Oxford 1988).
- Hilgard, A. *Theodosii Alexandrini Canones. Georgii Choerobosci Scholia. Sophronii Patriarchae Alexandrini Excerpta*, 2 vols. (Grammatici Graeci IV/1–2; Leipzig 1889–94).
- Hiller, E. 'Der grammatiker Pius und die ἀπολογίαι πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις Ἀριστάρχου', *Philologus* 28 (1869) 86–115.
- Hoekstra: see Heubeck and Hoekstra.
- Holwerda, D. *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars 1: Prolegomena de comoedia, Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes. Fasc. III 1, continens Scholia Vetera in Nubes* (Groningen 1977).
- Hopkinson, N. *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 27; Cambridge 1984).
- Hordern, J. H. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus* (Oxford 2002).
- Sophron's Mimes* (Oxford 2004).
- Hornblower, S. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1991–2008).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hunter, R. L. *Eubulus. The Fragments* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 24; Cambridge 1983).
- Hutchinson, G. O. *Aeschylus. Septem contra Thebas* (Oxford 1985).
- Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford 2001).
- James, A., and Lee, K. H. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna Posthomerica V* (Mnem. Suppl. 208; Leiden, Boston, Cologne 2000).
- Jebb, R. C. *Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part I: Oedipus Tyrannus* (Cambridge 1883¹, 1887², 1893³).
- id. Part II: Oedipus Coloneus* (Cambridge 1885¹, 1889², 1900³).
- id. Part III: The Antigone* (Cambridge 1888¹, 1891², 1900³).
- id. Part IV: The Philoctetes* (Cambridge 1890¹, 1898²).
- id. Part V: The Trachiniae* (Cambridge 1892).
- Jocelyn, H. D. *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 10; Cambridge 1967).
- Jowett, B. (transl.) *Thucydides* (Oxford 1879).
- Kannicht, R. *Euripides. Helena*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg 1969).
- Kapparis, K. A. *Apollodorus, Against Neaira [D. 59]* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 53; Berlin and New York 1999).
- Keil, B. *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia [Orations 17–53 only]* (Berlin 1898).
- Kovacs, P. D. *Euripides*, 6 vols. (Loeb Classical Library 9–12, 484, 495; London and Cambridge, MA 1994–2002).
- Küster, L. *Suidae Lexicon*, 3 vols. (Cambridge 1705).
- Kyriakou, P. A. *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 80; Berlin and New York 2006).
- Lasserre, F. *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos* (Texte und Kommentare 4; Berlin 1966).
- Latacz, J., Nünlist, R., and Stoevesandt, M. *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. Band I. Erster Gesang (A). Faszikel 2: Kommentar* (Munich and Leipzig 2002).
- Latte, K. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon [A – O only]*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen 1953–66).
- Leeuwen, J. van, *Aristophanis Equites* (Leiden 1900).
- Lehnus, L. *L'Inno a Pan di Pindaro* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 64; Milan 1979).
- Lenting, J. *Euripidis Andromache* (Zutphen 1829).
- Lentz, A. *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1867–70). [Includes fragments of Arcadius.]
- Lloyd-Jones, P. H. J. (transl.) *The Eumenides by Aeschylus* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1970).
- Sophocles*, 3 vols. (Loeb Classical Library 20, 21, 483; Cambridge, MA and London 1994, revised 1998 (vols. 1–2); 1996, revised 2003 (vol. 3)).
- MacDowell, D. M. *Aristophanes. Wasps* (Oxford 1971).

6. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME

- Demosthenes*. Against Meidias (Oration 21) (Oxford 1990).
- Macleod, C. W. *Homer*. Iliad Book xxiv (Cambridge 1982).
- Maehler, H. *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, 2 vols. (Mnem. Suppl. 62, 167; Leiden, New York, Cologne 1982–97).
- Magnelli, E. *Alexandri Aetoli Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Studi e Testi 15; Florence 1999).
- Malcovati, H. *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae*, 2 vols. (Turin 1953¹, 1976–9¹).
- Markland, J. *Euripidis Drama Supplices Mulieres* (London 1763).
- Martin, A., and Primavesi, O. *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg (P. Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665–1666)* (Berlin and New York 1999).
- Marx, F. C. *Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1904–5).
- Massimilla, G. *Callimacho. Aitia*, 2 vols. (Biblioteca di Studi Antichi 77, 92; Pisa 1996–2010).
- Mastronarde, D. J. *Euripides*. Phoenissae (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 29; Cambridge 1994).
- Euripides*. Medea (Cambridge 2002).
- Monk, J. H. *Euripidis Alcestis* (Cambridge 1816).
- Nauck, J. A. *Lexicon Vindobonense* (St Petersburg 1867).
- Nicole, J. *Les scolies Genevoises de l'Iliade*, 2 vols. (Paris 1891).
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and Hubbard, M. *A Commentary on Horace*. Odes Book I (Oxford 1970).
- A Commentary on Horace*. Odes Book II (Oxford 1978).
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and Rudd, N. *A Commentary on Horace*. Odes Book III (Oxford 2004).
- Norden, E. *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (Leipzig 1903¹, Stuttgart 1957⁴).
- Oakley, S. P. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*, vol. II. *Books VII–VIII* (Oxford 1998).
- Olson, S. D. *Aristophanes*. Peace (Oxford 1998).
- Aristophanes*. Acharnians (Oxford 2002).
- Broken Laughter. Selected Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford and New York 2007).
- Page, D. L. *Euripides*. Medea (Oxford 1938).
- Aeschylus septem quae supersunt tragoediae* (Oxford 1972).
- Parker, L. P. E. *Euripides*. Alcestis (Oxford 2007).
- Pearson, A. C. *The Fragments of Sophocles*, 3 vols. (Cambridge 1917).
- Pendrick, G. J. *Antiphon the Sophist. The Fragments* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 39; Cambridge 2002).
- Perry, B. E. *Babrius and Phaedrus* (Loeb Classical Library 436; Cambridge, MA and London 1965).
- Pfeiffer, R. C. F. O. *Callimachus*, 2 vols. (Oxford 1949–53).
- Piccirilli, L. *ΜΕΓΑΡΙΚΑ. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Testimonia 3 (Pisa 1975).
- Pierson, J. *Moeridis Atticistae Lexicon Atticum* (Leiden 1759).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Poltera, O. *Simonides Lyricus. Testimonia und Fragmente* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 35; Basel 2008).
- Porson, R. *Euripidis Hecuba* (London 1797¹, Cambridge 1802²).
- Euripidis Orestes* (London 1798).
- Euripidis Phoenissae* (London 1799).
- Euripidis Medea* (Cambridge 1801, London 1817).
- Φωτίου τοῦ Πατριάρχου Λέξεων Συναγωγή, 2 vols. (prepared for publication by P. P. Dobree; London 1822).
- Powell, J. G. F. *Cicero. Cato Maior de Senectute* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 28; Cambridge 1988).
- Rabe, H. 'Lexicon Messanense de iota ascripto', *RhM* n.F. 47 (1892) 404–13.
- Race, W. H. *Pindar*, 2 vols. (Loeb Classical Library 56, 485; Cambridge, MA and London 1997).
- Radt, S. L. *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Amsterdam 1958).
- Rhodes, P. J. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981, 1993 (with addenda)).
- Ribbeck, J. K. O. *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*² (Leipzig 1871). [1st edn 1852]
- Richardson, N. J. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974).
- Rose, V. *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Leipzig 1886).
- Ruhnkenius, D. *Timaei Sophistae Lexicon vocum Platoniarum* (Leiden 1754¹, 1789²).
- Rutherford, W. G. *The New Phrynichus: being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus* (London 1881).
- Sandbach, F. H. *Menandri reliquiae selectae* (Oxford 1972¹, 1990²).
- Schaefer, G. H. *Gregorii Corinthii et aliorum grammaticorum libri de dialectis linguae graecae. Quibus additur nunc primum editus Manueli Moschopuli libellus de vocum passionibus* (Leipzig 1811).
- Schierl, P. *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius* (Texte und Kommentare 28; Berlin and New York 2006).
- Schmidt, M(oritz) *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia* (Leipzig 1854).
- Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, 5 vols. (Jena 1858–68).
- Ἑπιτομή τῆς καθολικῆς προσφῶδιας Ἡρωδιανοῦ (Jena 1860).
- Schneider, O. *Callimachea*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1870–3).
- Schneider, R., and Uhlig, G. *Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt*, 2 vols. (Grammatici Graeci 1–2; Leipzig 1878–1910).
- Seaford, R. A. S. *Euripides. Cyclops* (Oxford 1984).
- Sider, D., and Brunschön, C. W. *Theophrastus of Eresus. On Weather Signs* (Philosophia Antiqua 104; Leiden and Boston 2007).
- Sier, K. *Die lyrischen Partien der Choephoren des Aischylos* (Palingenesia 23; Stuttgart 1988).

6. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME

- Skutsch, O. *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford 1985).
- Slater, W. J. *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 6; Berlin and New York 1986).
- Sommerstein, A. H. *The Comedies of Aristophanes*, vol. 1. *Acharnians* (Warminster 1980).
- Aeschylus. Eumenides* (Cambridge 1989).
- The Comedies of Aristophanes*, vol. 9. *Frogs* (Warminster 1996).
- Aeschylus*, 3 vols. (Loeb Classical Library 145, 146, 505; Cambridge, MA and London 2008).
- Stallbaum, G. *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1825–6).
- Stevens, P. T. *Euripides. Andromache* (Oxford 1971).
- Stockert, W. *Euripides. Iphigenie in Aulis*, 2 vols. (Wiener Studien Beiheft 16; Vienna 1992).
- Stoevesandt, M. *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. Band IV. Sechster Gesang (Ζ). Faszikel 2: Kommentar* (Berlin and New York 2008).
- Theodoridis, C. *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon* [A–M only], 2 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 1982–).
- Thiel, H. van, edition of the D scholia to the *Iliad*, available at <http://kups.uni-koeln.de/volltexte/2006/1810/> [URL checked 20.2.11]
- Thilo, G., and Hagen, H. *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1878–1902).
- Tittmann, J. A. H. *Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1808).
- Valkenaer, L. C. *Euripidis tragoedia Phoenissae* (Franeker 1755).
- Euripidis tragoedia Hippolytus* (Leiden 1768).
- Valk, M. H. A. L. H. van der, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, 4 vols. (Leiden, New York, Copenhagen, Cologne 1971–87).
- Verdenius, W. J. *Commentaries on Pindar*, vol. 1. *Olympian Odes* 3, 7, 12, 14 (Mnem. Suppl. 97; Leiden 1987).
- Verrall, A. W. *The Choephori of Aeschylus* (London 1893).
- Voigt, E.-M. *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta* (Amsterdam 1971).
- Wagman, R. *L'inno epidaurico a Pan. Il culto di Pan a Epidauro* (Biblioteca di Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 14; Pisa 2000).
- Wankel, H. *Demosthenes. Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg 1976).
- Watson, L. C. *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford 2003).
- Wehrli, F. *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar. Heft I: Dikaiarchos* (Basel 1944¹, 1967²).
- Wessner, P. *Aeli Donati quod fertur commentum Terenti. Accedunt Eugraphi commentum et scholia Bombina*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1902–8).
- West, M. L. *Hesiod. Theogony* (Oxford 1966).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hesiod. Works and Days* (Oxford 1978).
Theognidis et Phocylidis fragmenta et adespotata quaedam gnomica (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 192; Berlin and New York 1978).
Euripides. Orestes (Warminster 1987).
Aeschylus. Tragoediae (Stuttgart and Leipzig 1990, corrected 1998).
Homerus. Ilias, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, Leipzig, Munich 1998–2000).
 West, S. R.: see Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth.
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, E. F. W. U. von, *Euripides. Herakles*, 2 vols. (Berlin 1889¹, 1895²).
Aeschyli Tragoediae (Berlin 1914).
 Wilkins, J. *Euripides. Heraclidae* (Oxford 1993).
 Willink, C. W. *Euripides. Orestes* (Oxford 1986).
 Wilson, N. G. *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars 1: Prolegomena de comoedia, Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes. Fasc. I B, continens Scholia in Aristophanis Acharnenses* (Groningen 1975).
 Wimmer, F. *Theophrasti Eresii opera quae supersunt omnia* (Paris 1866).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Abresch, F. L. (1743) *Animadversionum ad Aeschylum Libri Duo. Accedunt Adnotationes ad quaedam loca N. Testamenti* (Middelburg).
 Adams, J. N. (1992) 'Iteration of compound verb with simplex in Latin prose', *Eikasmos* 3: 295–8.
 Aerts, W. J. (1965) *Periphrastica. An Investigation into the Use of εἶναι and ἔχειν as Auxiliaries or Pseudo-Auxiliaries in Greek from Homer up to the Present Day* (Publications issued under the auspices of the Byzantine-New Greek seminary of the University of Amsterdam 2; Amsterdam).
 Aerts, W. J., Lokin, J. H. A., Radt., S. L., and Wal, N. van der (1985) (eds.) *ΣΧΟΛΙΑ. Studia ad criticam interpretationemque textuum Graecorum et ad historiam iuris Graeco-Romani pertinentia viro doctissimo D. Holwerda oblata* (Groningen).
 Ahrens, H. L. (1851) 'Homerische excursus', *Philologus* 6: 1–34. [= (1891) 114–22] (1891) *Kleine Schriften von Heinrich Rudolf Ahrens. Erster Band. Zur Sprachwissenschaft* (ed. C. Haeblerlin; Hannover).
 Aikaterinidis, G. (2001) (ed.) *Mesogaia. History and Culture of Mesogeia in Attica* (Athens).
 Alberti, G. B. (1987) review of A. Colonna (ed.) *Sophocles Fabulae*, vol. III (Turin 1983) and Ferrari (1983), *Prometheus* 13: 187–9.
 Alberti, G. B. et al. (1982) *Studi in Onore di Aristide Colonna* (Perugia).
 Alcock, S. E., and Osborne, R. (1994) (eds.) *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece* (Oxford).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Alden, M. *et al.* (1983) *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence).
- Alexiou, M. (2002) *The Ritual Lament in the Greek Tradition*² (revised by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos; Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford). [1st edn London 1974]
- Alfonsi, L. *et al.* (1960) *Studi in Onore di Luigi Castiglioni*, 2 vols. (Florence).
- Allan, A. (2007) 'Masters of manipulation: Euripides' (and Medea's) use of oaths in *Medea*', in Sommerstein and Fletcher (2007) 113–24, 245–8.
- Allan, R. J. (2006) 'Sophocles' voice. Active, middle, and passive in the plays of Sophocles', in de Jong and Rijksbaron (2006) 111–26.
- Allan, R. J., and Buijs, M. (2007) (eds.) *The Language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 13; Leiden and Boston).
- Allan, W. (2006) 'Divine justice and cosmic order in early Greek epic', *JHS* 126: 1–35.
- Anderson, A. R. (1914) 'Studies in the exclamatory infinitive', *CP* 9: 60–76.
- Anderson, M. J. (1965) (ed.) *Classical Drama and its Influence. Essays presented to H. D. F. Kitto* (London).
- Anderson, M(ichael) J. (1997) *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Oxford).
- André, J. *et al.* (1976) *Scritti in Onore di Giuliano Bonfante*, 2 vols. (Brescia).
- André-Salvini, B., and Salvini, M. (1996) 'Fixa cacumine montis. Nouvelles considérations sur le relief rupestre de la prétendue "Niobé" du Mont Sipyle', in Gasche and Hrouda (1996) 7–20.
- Andronikos, M. (1968) *Totenkult* (Archaeologica Homerica 3; Göttingen).
- Anghelina, C. (2008) 'The immovable Olympus', *JIES* 36: 428–41. [Bibliography in *JIES* 37 (2009) 275–9]
- Anonymous A (1810) review of T. Stanley (ed.) *Aeschyl's Tragoediae* (ed. S. Butler; Cambridge 1810), *The Quarterly Review* vol. 3 no. 6: 389–98.
- Anonymous B (1811) review of Lobeck¹, *Jena'sche Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* vol. 1 no. 15–18: 113–41.
- Anonymous C (1817) 'In Sophoclis Ajacem emendationes', *The Classical Journal* vol. 15 no. 30: 371–2.¹⁰
- Anonymous D (1818) 'Annotationes in Sophoclis Antigonom, ex recensione Carol. Aug. Erfurdii', *The Classical Journal* vol. 17 no. 33: 52–65.
- Armstrong, R. (2006) *Cretan Women. Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin Poetry* (Oxford).
- Arnautoglou, I. (1998) *Ancient Greek Laws. A Sourcebook* (London and New York).

¹⁰ Cf. the introduction, itself anonymous (p. 371): 'Haec emendationum sylloge confecta est e Schedis Viri apud Oxonienses doctrina cumulatissimi. Is, Brunckiana editione nondum visa, has conjecturas paucas margini editionis Johnsonianae adlevit, nonnullis quoque adjectis, quas e libro olim Toupiano, non ante vulgatas, descripserat.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnesano, D. (1999) 'Il palinsesto *Laur. Conv. Soppr.* 152. Note paleografiche e codicologiche', *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* n.s. 53 [= S. Lucà and L. Perria (eds.) *Ὀπωρεα. Studi in onore di mgr Paul Canart per il LXX compleanno*]: 213–38.
- Arnott, P. (1962) *Greek Scenic Conventions in the Fifth Century BC.* (Oxford).
- Arnott, W. G. (2001) 'Some orthographical problems in the papyri of later Greek comedy I: πρ(ι)είν (along with compounds and congeners)', *ΖΠΕ* 134: 43–51.
- (2002) 'Some orthographical variants in the papyri of later Greek comedy', in Willi (2002) 191–217.
- Ausfeld, C. (1903) *De Graecorum precatationibus quaestiones* (Jahrb. für class. Phil. Suppl. 28 pp. 503–47; Leipzig).
- Avezzi, G. (2003) (ed.) *Il dramma sofocleo. Testo, lingua, interpretazione* (Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 13; Stuttgart and Weimar).
- Åzeli, J. E. (1897) *De Assimilatione syntactica apud Sophoclem* (diss. Uppsala).
- Babbitt, F. C. (1901) 'The use of μή in questions', *HSCP* 12: 307–17.
- Bailey, C. et al. (1936) (eds.) *Greek Poetry and Life. Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on his Seventieth Birthday, January 2, 1936* (Oxford).
- Bain, D. M. (1981) *Masters, Servants and Orders in Greek Tragedy. A Study of Some Aspects of Dramatic Technique and Convention* (Publications of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Manchester 26; Manchester).
- (1987) 'Some reflections on the illusion in Greek tragedy', *BICS* 34: 1–14.
- (2007) 'Low words in high places: sex, bodily functions, and body parts in Homeric epic and other higher genres', in Finglass et al. (2007) 40–57.
- Bamberg, A. von (1874) 'Thatsachen der attischen Formenlehre', *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-Wesen* n.F. 8: 616–25.
- Barker, E. T. E. (2004) 'The fall-out from dissent: hero and audience in Sophocles' *Ajax*', *G&R* 2nd ser. 51: 1–20.
- Barrett, J. (2002) *Staged Narrative. Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy* (London, Berkeley, Los Angeles).
- Barrett, W. S. (2007) *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism. Collected Papers*, assembled and edited by M. L. West (Oxford).
- Barringer, J. M., and Hurwit, J. M. (2005) (eds.) *Periclean Athens and its Legacy. Problems and Perspectives* (Austin, TX).
- Basson, A. F., and Dominik, W. J. (2003) (eds.) *Literature, Art, History. Studies on Classical Antiquity and Tradition in Honour of W. J. Henderson* (Frankfurt am Main etc.).
- Battezzato, L. (2000) 'Gli aggettivi in –πετης: senso, accento e teorie bizantine nei vocabolari moderni', *Glotta* 76: 139–61.
- (2001) 'Enjambement, iati e stile di recitazione nella tragedia greca', *SemRom* 4: 1–38. [= (2008) 103–38]

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- (2003) (ed.) *Tradizione testuale e ricezione letteraria antica della tragedia greca. Atti del convegno Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa 14–15 giugno 2002* (Amsterdam).
- (2008) *Linguistica e retorica della tragedia greca* (Sussidi Eruditi 78; Rome).
- Battier, S. (pre-1744) manuscript notes published posthumously as 'Samuelis Battierii notae quaedam in Sophoclis tragoedias', *Museum Helveticum ad iuvandas literas in publicos usus apertum* 24 (1752) 612–17, the pagination of which I cite.
- Beazley, J. D. (1986) *The Development of Attic Black-Figure²* (Sather Classical Lectures 24; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London). [1st edn 1951]
- Beer, J. (2004) *Sophocles and the Tragedy of Athenian Democracy* (Contributions in Drama and Theatre Studies 105; Westport, CT).
- Belardinelli, A. M. (2000) 'A proposito dell'uso e della funzione dell'ekkyklema: Eur. *Hipp.* 170–266, 808–1101; Men. *Asp.* 309–399, *Dysc.* 689–758a', *Sem-Rom* 3: 243–65.
- Belfiore, E. (1998) 'Harming friends: problematic reciprocity in Greek tragedy', in Gill *et al.* (1998) 139–58.
- Benloew, L. (1839) *De Sophoclis Aiace* (diss. Göttingen).
- Bentley, R. (pre-1742) manuscript notes published posthumously as 'R. Bentleyi Emendatt. Mss. in Sophoclem, Theocritum, Bionem, Moschum, Nican-drum, et Callimachum', *The Classical Journal* vol. 13 no. 26 (1816) 244–52, the pagination of which I cite.
- Berger, E. (1968) 'Zur Deutung einer neuen Schale des Kodrosmalers', *AK* 11: 125–36.
- Bergk, T. (1845) 'Ueber die Kritik im Theognis', *RhM* n.F. 3: 206–33.
- (1848) 'Zur Kritik und Erklärung. Sieben Conjecturen zu Sophokles', *RhM* n.F. 6: 145–51.
- (1849) 'Quaestionum Sophoclearum', *Ind. Lect. Hib.* 1848–9 (Marburg).
- (1850) review of A. Jacob (ed.), *Sophokles Antigone* (Berlin 1849), *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* ('Zimmermann's Zeitschrift') 8: 558–63.
- (1851) review of Wunder's *Philoctetes* (Gotha and Erfurt 1848), Hermann's *Ajax and Trachiniae* (Leipzig 1848), and Dindorf's *Sophocles* (Oxford 1849), *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 61: 227–50.
- (1868) review of Nauck's 1867 edition, *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* Band 97 Heft 6: 361–91.
- (1879) 'Verzeichniss der Siege dramatischer Dichter in Athen', *RhM* n.F. 34: 292–333.
- Bers, V. (1974) *Enallage and Greek Style* (Mnem. Suppl. 29; Leiden).
- (1984) *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age* (Yale Classical Monographs; New Haven and London).
- (1997) *Speech in Speech. Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, London).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berthold, O. (1911) *Die Unverwundbarkeit in Sage und Aberglauben der Griechen, mit einem Anhang über den Unverwundbarkeitsglauben bei anderen Völkern, besonders den Germanen* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 11.1; Giessen).
- Bethe, E. (1896) *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Theaters im Altertum* (Leipzig).
- Bevilacqua, F. (1973) 'Questioni sofoclee', *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione dell'edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* n.s. 21: 61–78.
- Biggs, P. (1966) 'The disease theme in Sophocles' *Ajax*, *Philoctetes* and *Trachiniae*', *CP* 61: 223–35.
- Björck, G. (1950) *Das Alpha impurum und die tragische Kunstsprache. Attische Wort- und Stilstudien* (Acta Societatis Litterarum Humaniorum Regiae Upsaliensis 39.1; Uppsala).
- Blaydes, F. H. M. (1899) *Adversaria Critica in Sophoclem* (Halle).
- Blech, M. (1982) *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 38; Berlin and New York).
- Blume, H.-D. (2004a) 'The staging of Sophocles' *Aias*', *Mediterranean Archaeology* 17: 113–20.
- (2004b) 'Bühnenbilder: Geschehenes und Vorgestelltes im attischen Theater', in Gebauer *et al.* (2004) 17–28.
- Blundell, M. W. (1989) *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies. A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge).
- Boardman, J. (1997) 'Pan', *LIMC* VIII/1: 923–41.
- Boedeker, D. (1984) *Descent from Heaven. Images of Dew in Greek Poetry and Religion* (American Classical Studies 13; Chico, CA).
- Boedeker, D., and Raaflaub, K. A. (1998) (eds.) *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Boegehold, A. L. *et al.* (1984) (eds.) *Studies presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday* (Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs 10; Durham, NC).
- Bolkestein, H. (1939) *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum. Ein Beitrag zum Problem 'Moral und Gesellschaft'* (Utrecht).
- Booth, N. B. (1976) 'Zeus hypsistos megistos: an argument for enclitic πού in Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 182', *CQ* n.s. 26: 220–8.
- Borchhardt, J. (1972) *Homerische Helme. Helmformen der Ägäis in ihren Beziehungen zu orientalischen und europäischen Helmen in der Bronze- und frühen Eisenzeit* (Mainz am Rhein).
- Borgeaud, P. (1979) *Recherches sur le dieu Pan* (diss. Geneva).
- (1988) *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece* (transl. K. Atlass and J. Redfield; Chicago and London).
- Boudon-Millot, V., Guardasole, A., and Magdelaine, C. (2007) (eds.) *La science médicale antique. Nouveaux regards. Études réunies en l'honneur de Jacques Jouanna* (Paris).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Boulter, C. G. (1985) (ed.) *Greek Art, Archaic into Classical. A Symposium held at the University of Cincinnati April 2–3, 1982* (Cincinnati Classical Studies n.s. 5; Leiden).
- Bowersock, G. W., Burkert, W., and Putnam, M. C. J. (1979) (eds.) *Arktouros. Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Berlin and New York).
- Bradshaw, D. J. (1991) 'The Ajax myth and the polis: old values and new', in Pozzi and Wickersham (1991) 99–125.
- Braswell, B. K. (1979) 'Ζαμενής: a lexicographical note on Pindar', *Glotta* 57: 182–90.
- Braund, S. M., and Most, G. W. (2003) (eds.) *Ancient Anger. Perspectives from Homer to Galen* (Yale Classical Studies 32; Cambridge).
- Bremer, J. M., Radt, S. L., and Ruijgh, C. J. (1976) (eds.) *Miscellanea Tragica in Honorem J. C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam).
- Bremmer, J. N. (1987) (ed.) *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London).
(2002) 'Sacrificing a child in ancient Greece: the case of Iphigeneia', in Noort and Tigchelaar (2002) 21–43.
- Broadhead, H. D. (1961) 'Some textual problems in Sophocles', *BICS* 8: 49–58.
(1968) *Tragica. Elucidations of Passages in Greek Tragedy* (University of Canterbury Publications 8; Christchurch, NZ).
- Brock, R. (2010) 'Citizens and non-citizens in Athenian tragedy', in Harris *et al.* (2010) 94–107.
- Brommer, F. (1949–50) 'Pan im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.', *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 15: 5–42.
(1971–6) *Denkmälerlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*, 4 vols. (Marburg).
- Brown, A. L. (1984) 'Three and scene-painting Sophocles', *PCPS* n.s. 30: 1–17.
- Brown, W. E. (1965) 'Sophocles' Ajax and Homer's Hector', *CJ* 61: 118–21.
- Browning, R. (1983) *Medieval and Modern Greek*² (Cambridge). [1st edn London 1969]
- Budelmann, F. (1999) 'Notes on the text of Sophocles', *BICS* 43: 171–6.
(2000) *The Language of Sophocles. Communal, Communication and Involvement* (Cambridge).
- Bundrick, S. D. (2005) *Music and Image in Classical Athens* (Cambridge and New York).
- Bürchner, L. (1922) 'Knosos', *RE* 11: 922–9.
- Burges, G. (1815) 'In carmina epodica Aeschylea commentarius', *The Classical Journal* vol. 11 no. 22: 242–8.
- Burgess, J. S. (2001) *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore and London).
- Burian, P. (1972) 'Supplication and hero cult in Sophocles' *Ajax*', *GRBS* 13: 151–6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burkert, W. (1966) 'Greek tragedy and sacrificial ritual', *GRBS* 7: 87–121.
 [transl. S. R. West; = (2001) 1–36]
 (2001) *Savage Energies. Lessons of Myth and Ritual in Ancient Greece* (transl. P. Bing and S. R. West; Chicago and London).
 (2007) 'Smileumata Iliaka: three puzzling verses', in Finglass *et al.* (2007) 58–65.
- Burnett, A. P. (2005) *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* (Oxford).
- Burton, R. W. B. (1980) *The Chorus in Sophocles' Tragedies* (Oxford).
- Burzacchini, G., and Neri, C. (2004) 'Omertà femminile (Soph. *Phaedr.* fr. 679 R.²)', in Cerasuolo (2004) 153–58.
- Buxton, R. G. A. (1980) 'Blindness and limits: Sophokles and the logic of myth', *JHS* 100: 22–37.
 (1982) *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy. A Study of Peitho* (Cambridge).
 (2006) 'Weapons and white horses: the language of *Ajax*', in De Jong and Rijksbaron (2006) 13–23.
- Byron, G. G., Lord (1809) letter to Catherine Gordon Byron, published in Marchand (1973) 226–31 and McGann (1986) 971–5. [Both paginations cited]
- Bywater, I. (1914) 'The Latinizations of the modern surname', *JPh* 33: 76–94.
- Cairns, D. L. (1993a) *Aidōs. The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford).
 (1993b) 'Affronts and quarrels in the *Iliad*', in F. Cairns and Heath (1993) 155–67. [= (2001) 203–19]
 (1996) 'Hybris, dishonour, and thinking big', *JHS* 116: 1–32.
 (2001) (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford).
 (2003) 'Ethics, ethology, terminology: Iliadic anger and the cross-cultural study of emotion', in Braund and Most (2003) 11–49.
 (2005a) (ed.) *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Swansea).
 (2005b) 'Bullish looks and sidelong glances: social interaction and the eyes in ancient Greek culture', in (2005a) 123–55.
 (2006) 'Virtue and vicissitude: the paradoxes of the *Ajax*', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) 99–131.
- Cairns, D. L., and Liapis, V. (2006) (eds.) *Dionysalexandros. Essays on Aeschylus and his Fellow Tragedians in Honour of Alexander F. Garvie* (Swansea).
- Cairns, F., and Heath, M. F. (1993) (eds.) *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar. Seventh Volume 1993. Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Rhetoric and Poetry* (ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 32; Leeds).
- Calder, W. M. (1922) 'Two notes on the *Agamemnon*', *CR* 36: 163.
- Calder, W. M. III (1965) 'The entrance of Athena in *Ajax*', *CP* 60: 114–16.
 [= (2005) 67–71]
 (1974) 'Once more: the entrance and exit of Athene in *Ajax*', *Classical Folia* 28: 59–61.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- (2005) *Theatrokratia. Collected Papers on the Politics and Staging of Greco-Roman Tragedy* (Spudasmata 104; ed. R. S. Smith; Hildesheim, Zurich, New York).
- Camerer, R. (1953) 'Zu Sophokles' *Aias*', *Gymnasium* 60: 289–327.
- Campe, J. F. C. (1867) *Quaestionum Sophoclearum pars tertia* (Progr. Greiffenberg).
- Cantarella, E. (2007) (ed.) *Symposion 2005. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Salerno, 14.–18. September 2005). Comunicazioni sul diritto greco ed ellenistico (Salerno, 14–18 settembre 2005)* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften philosophisch-historische Klasse. Akten der Gesellschaft für griechische und hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte 19; Vienna).
- Cantarella, R. (1965) 'Una sentenza di Agatone in Dante', *RCCM* 7: 266–8. [= (1970) 321–3]
- (1970) *Scritti Minori sul Teatro Greco* (Brescia).
- Carden, R. (1974) *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles* (Texte und Kommentare 7; Berlin and New York).
- Carey, C. (2007) 'Tragic law', *Dioniso* n.s. 6: 22–33.
- Casabona, J. (1966) *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec des origines à la fin de l'époque classique* (Publication des annales de la faculté des lettres Aix-en-Provence n.s. 56; Aix-en-Provence).
- Càssola Guida, P. (1973) *Le armi difensive dei Micenei nelle figurazioni* (Incunabula Graeca 56; Rome).
- Càssola Guida, P., and Zucconi Galli Fonseca, M. (1992) *Nuovi studi sulle armi dei Micenei* (Università degli Studi di Trieste Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità 1; Rome).
- Casson, L. (1971) *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton).
- Cerasuolo, S. (2004) (ed.) *Mathesis e Mneme. Studi in memoria di Marcello Gigante*, 2 vols. (Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Filologia Classica 'Francesco Arnaldi' dell'Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II 25; Naples).
- Chandler, H. W. (1881) *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*² (Oxford). [1st edn 1862]
- Chantraine, P. (1946–7) 'Les noms du mari et de la femme du père et de la mère en grec', *REG* 59–60: 219–50.
- Christensen, J. (1999) 'Vindicating Vitruvius on the subject of perspective', *JHS* 119: 161–6.
- Christiansen, J., and Melander, T. (1988) (eds.) *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery. Copenhagen August 31 – September 4 1987* (Copenhagen).
- Christodoulou, G. A. (1986) *Σύμμικτα Κριτικά* (Athens).
- Clark, A. J., and Gaunt, J. (2002) (eds.) *Essays in Honor of Dietrich von Bothmer* (Allard Pierson Series 14; Amsterdam).
- Clarke, M. J. (2004) 'The semantics of colour in the early Greek word-hoard', in Cleland and Stears (2004) 131–9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cleland, L., and Stears, K. (2004) (eds.) *Colour in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (BAR International Series 1267; Oxford).
- Cohen, A., and Rutter, J. B. (2007) (eds.) *Constructions of Childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy* (Hesperia Suppl. 41; Princeton).
- Collard, C. (1969) 'Athenaeus, the epitome, Eustathius and quotations from tragedy', *RFIC* 3rd ser. 97: 157–79. [= (2007) 69–92, with endnote]
- (1986) review of Diggle, Euripides OCT, volume 1, *CR* n.s. 36: 17–24.
[= (2007) 180–90, with endnote]
- (2005a) 'Colloquial language in tragedy: a supplement to the work of P. T. Stevens', *CQ* n.s. 55: 350–86.
- (2005b) 'Euripidean fragmentary plays. The nature of sources and their effect on reconstruction', in McHardy *et al.* (2005) 49–62.
- (2006) 'Tragic persons in pieces, in fragments at first, and lastly in *Choephori* 211', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) 49–61.
- (2007) *Tragedy, Euripides and Euripideans* (Exeter).
- (2009) 'Atreids in fragments (and elsewhere)' in Cousland and Hume (2009) 309–20.
- Colvin, S. (1999) *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford).
- Conomis, N. C. (1964) 'The dochmiacs of Greek drama', *Hermes* 92: 23–50.
- Cook, A. B. (1914–40) *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*, 3 vols. (Cambridge).
- Corlu, A. (1966) *Recherches sur les mots relatifs à l'idée de prière, d'Homère aux tragiques* (Études et commentaires 64; Paris).
- Cosi, D. M. (2001) (ed.) *L'arkteia di Brauron e i culti femminili* (Bologna).
- Costa, G. (1984) 'Il dio d'oro in grecia e in India: lingua poetica e tradizione religiosa', *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 69: 26–52.
- Cousland, J. R. C., and Hume, J. R. (2009) (eds.) *The Play of Texts and Fragments. Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp* (Mnem. Suppl. 314; Leiden and Boston).
- Csapo, E. G. (2002) 'Kallipides on the floor-sweepings: the limits of realism in classical acting and performance styles', in Easterling and Hall (2002) 127–47.
- (2004) 'Some social and economic conditions behind the rise of the acting profession in the fifth and fourth centuries BC', in Hugoniot *et al.* (2004) 53–76.
- Csapo, E. G., and Slater, W. J. (1994) *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor).
- 'Ctesiphon' (1813) 'Collation of two MSS. of Sophocles', *The Classical Journal* vol. 7 no. 14: 428–36.
- Cuny, A. L. M. (1906) *Le nombre duel en grec* (diss. Paris).
- Cuomo, S. (2007) *Technology and Culture in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Cambridge).
- Dahlmann, H., and Merkelbach, R. (1959) (eds.) *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik* (Festschrift G. Jachmann; Cologne and Opladen).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Dale, A. M. (1936) 'Lyrical clausulae in Sophocles', in Bailey *et al.* (1936) 181–205. [= (1969) 1–24]
 (1950) 'The metrical units of Greek lyric verse. 1', *CQ* 44: 138–48. [= (1969) 41–60]
 (1959) 'Ethos and dianoia: "character" and "thought" in Aristotle's *Poetics*', *AUMLA* 11: 3–16. [= (1969) 139–55 = A. Laird (2006) 142–57]
 (1960) review of Dain's edition of Sophocles, vol. II (Paris 1958), *CR* n.s. 10: 16–19.
 (1968) *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*² (Cambridge). [1st edn 1948]
 (1969) *Collected Papers* (ed. T. B. L. Webster and E. G. Turner; Cambridge).
 (1971–83) *Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses*, 3 vols. (BICS Suppl. 21.1–3, ed. T. B. L. Webster and E. W. Handley; London).
 Dalfen, J., Petersmann, G., and Schwarz, F. F. (1993) (eds.) *Religio Graeco-Romana. Festschrift für Walter Pötscher* (Grazer Beiträge Suppl. 5; Graz and Horn).
 Davidson, J. F. (1975) 'The parodos of Sophocles' *Ajax*', *BICS* 22: 163–77.
 (1976) 'Sophocles, *Ajax* 192–200', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 29: 129–35.
 (1983) 'Sophocles, *Ajax* 172–79', *AJP* 104: 192–8.
 (1984) 'Sophocles, *Ajax* 148–50', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 37: 438–40.
 Davidson, J. F., Muecke, F., and Wilson, P. (2006) (eds.) *Greek Drama III. Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee* (BICS Suppl. 87; London).
 Davies, M. (1979) review of West's edition of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, *CR* n.s. 29: 202–6.
 (1981) 'The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* book xxiv', *JHS* 101: 56–62.
 (1982) 'The end of Sophocles' O.T.', *Hermes* 110: 268–78.
 (1985) 'Conventional topics of invective in Alcaeus', *Prometheus* 11: 31–9.
 (1986) 'The motif of the πρώτος εὐρετής in Alcman', *ΖΡΕ* 65: 25–7.
 (1987) 'The ancient Greeks on why mankind does not live for ever', *MH* 44: 65–75.
 (1989a) *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol).
 (1989b) 'Sisyphus and the invention of religion ("Critias" *TrGF* I (43) F 19 = B 25 DK)', *BICS* 36: 16–32.
 (2001) 'Homer and the fable: *Odyssey* 21.293–306', *Prometheus* 27: 193–210.
 (2002) 'ΕΠΙΣΤΑΣ ΕΙΠΕ: the meaning of ΕΦΙΣΤΗΜΙ in Aristophanes' *WASPS* 1430 and related passages', *Glotta* 78: 36–43.
 (2007) 'Comic *opsimathia* in Aristophanes' *Clouds*', *Prometheus* 33: 17–24.
 (2010) "'Sins of the fathers": omitted sacrifices and offended deities in Greek literature and the folk-tale', *Eikasmos* 21: 331–55.
 Davies, M. I. (1973) 'Ajax and Tekmessa. A cup by the Brygos Painter in the Barciss Collection', *AK* 16: 60–70.
 (1985) 'Ajax at the bourne of life', in Metzger (1985) 83–117.
 Davison, C. C. (2009) *Pheidias. The Sculptures and Ancient Sources*, 3 vols. (BICS Suppl. 105.1–3; London).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dawe, R. D. (1964) *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge).
 (1968) 'Emendations in Sophocles', *PCPS* n.s. 14: 8–18.
 (1988) 'Miscellanea critica', *CP* 83: 97–111. [= (2007) 135–49]
 (1998) 'ΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΡΙΤ' ΕΣΤΙ . . . Editing Sophocles for the third time', in Most (1998) 111–22. [= (2007) 233–44]
 (2002–3) 'On editing Sophocles, Oxford style', *ICS* 27–8: 1–19. [= (2007) 347–65]
 (2007) *Corruption and Correction. A Collection of Articles* (Amsterdam).
- Dawe, R. D., Diggle, J., and Easterling, P. E. (1978) (eds.) *Dionysiaca. Nine Studies in Greek Poetry by Former Pupils Presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday* (Cambridge).
- Dawes, R. (1745) *Miscellanea Critica in sectiones quinque dispersita* (Cambridge).
- Deacy, S., and Villing, A. (2001) (eds.) *Athena in the Classical World* (Leiden, Boston, Cologne).
- Degani, E. (1961) *ΑΙΩΝ da Omero ad Aristotele* (Università di Padova pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia 37; Padua). [2nd edn 2001; n.v.]
 (1962) 'ΑΙΑΝΗΣ', *Helikon* 2: 37–56. [= (2004) II 817–36]
 (1966) 'Hesychiana', *QJFG* 1: 42–7. [= (2004) II 694–9]
 (2004) *Filologia e Storia. Scritti di Enzo Degani* (ed. M. G. Albani and 14 others; Spudasmata 95; Hildesheim, Zurich, New York).
- Degen, H. (1900) *De Troianis Scaenicis Specimina Duo. Accedit Appendix 'De Teucro Teucrisque'* (diss. Leipzig).
- De Marco, V. (1936) 'Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii sofoclei', *SIFC* n.s. 13: 3–44.
 (1937) *De Scholiis in Sophoclis Tragoediis Veteribus* (Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 6° ser. 6.2; Rome).
- De Martino, F., and Sommerstein, A. H. (1995) (eds.) *Lo spettacolo delle voci*, 2 vols. in one (le Rane 14; Bari).
 (1999) (eds.) *Studi sull'eufemismo* (le Rane 26; Bari).
- Denniston, J. D. (1952) *Greek Prose Style* (prepared for publication by P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones; Oxford).
- Deventer, L. G. van (1851) *Specimen litterarium inaugurale de interpolationibus quibusdam in Sophoclis tragoediis* (diss. Leiden).
- Dickey, E. (1996) *Greek Forms of Address. From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford).
 (2007) *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period* (Oxford and New York).
- Dickie, M. W. (1976) 'On the meaning of ἐφήμερος', *ICS* 1: 7–14.
 (1984) 'Hēsychia and hybris in Pindar', in Gerber (1984) 83–109.
- Diggle, J. (1969) 'Marginalia Euripidea', *PCPS* n.s. 15: 30–59. [= (1994) 5–33]

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- (1971) 'Notes on the *Cyclops* of Euripides', *CQ* n.s. 21: 42–50. [= (1994) 34–43]
 (1972) 'Notes on the *Heracleidae* of Euripides', *CQ* n.s. 22: 241–5.
 [= (1994) 51–8]
 (1973) 'The *Supplices* of Euripides', *GRBS* 14: 241–69. [= (1994) 59–89]
 (1974) 'On the *Heracles* and *Ion* of Euripides', *PCPS* n.s. 20: 3–36. [= (1994) 90–136]
 (1976a) 'Notes on the *Iphigenia in Tauris* of Euripides', *PCPS* n.s. 22: 42–5.
 [= (1994) 148–51]
 (1976b) 'Sophocles, *Ajax* 589', *Prometheus* 2: 83.
 (1977) 'Notes on the *Electra* of Euripides', *ICS* 2: 110–24. [= (1994) 152–68]
 (1978) 'On the *Helen* of Euripides' in Dawe *et al.* (1978) 159–77. [= (1994) 176–95]
 (1981a) *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford).
 (1981b) 'On the *Alcestis* and *Andromache* of Euripides', *ICS* 6: 82–101.
 [= (1994) 196–215]
 (1981c) 'Euripides, *Supplices* 508–9', *Prometheus* 7: 122. [= (1994) 219]
 (1981d) 'Euripides, *Iph. T.* 159ff. and Mr Sansone', *QUCC* n.s. 8: 161–3.
 [= (1994) 216–18]
 (1982) 'Further notes on the *Heracleidae* of Euripides', *PCPS* n.s. 28: 57–63.
 [= (1994) 220–8]
 (1983) 'On the manuscripts and text of Euripides, *Medea*. I. The manuscripts', *CQ* n.s. 33: 339–57. [= (1994) 250–72]
 (1984a) 'On the manuscripts and text of Euripides, *Medea*. II. The text', *CQ* n.s. 34: 50–65. [= (1994) 273–97]
 (1984b) review of West (1982), *CR* n.s. 34: 66–71. [= (1994) 313–19 (abbrev.)]
 (1989) 'Notes on the *Phoenissae* of Euripides', *SIFC* 3° ser. 7: 196–206.
 [= (1994) 341–52]
 (1990) 'On the *Orestes* of Euripides', *CQ* n.s. 40: 100–23. [= (1994) 362–99]
 (1991) *The Textual Tradition of Euripides* Orestes (Oxford).
 (1992) review of H. C. Günther (ed.), *Euripides. Iphigenia Aulidensis* (Leipzig 1988), *CR* n.s. 42: 9–14. [= (1994) 407–15]
 (1994) *Euripidea. Collected Essays* (Oxford).
 (1996a) 'Sophocles, *Ichneutae* (fr. 314 Radt)', *ŽPE* 112: 3–17.
 (1996b) 'P.Oxy. XLVII, 3317: Euripides, Antigone or Antiope' *APF* 42: 164–7.
 (1996c) 'P. Petrie 1.1–2: Euripides, *Antiope* (fr. 223 (Nauck) Kannicht, XLVIII Kambitsis', *PCPS* n.s. 42: 106–26.
 (1997) 'Notes on fragments of Euripides', *CQ* n.s. 47: 98–108.
 (1998) 'Greek and Latin in Coleridge's notebooks', *Notes and Queries* n.s. 45: 193–9.
 (2006) 'On the text of Catullus', *MD* 57: 85–104.
 (2007) 'Housman's Greek', in Finglass *et al.* (2007) 145–69.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dijk, G.-J. van (1997) *AINOI, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ. Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature with a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre* (Mnem. Suppl. 166; Leiden, New York, Cologne).
- Dik, H. (2007) *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue* (Oxford).
- Dill, V. and Walde, C. (2009) (eds.) *Antike Mythen. Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen* (Berlin and New York).
- Diller, H. (1956) 'Der vorphilosophische Gebrauch von κόσμος und κοσμεῖν', in Erbse *et al.* (1956) 47–60. [= (1971) 73–87]
(1971) *Kleine Schriften zur antiken Literatur* (ed. H.-J. Newiger and H. Seyffert; Munich).
- Dillon, M. (2002) *Gods and Women in Classical Greek Religion* (London and New York).
- Di Marco, M. (1997) 'Un motivo dell'epigramma funebre in Sofocle (Ai. 845–851)', *MD* 38: 143–52.
- Dindorf, K. W. (1836) *Ad Sophoclis tragoedias annotationes* (Oxford).
- Dittenberger, W. (1881) 'Sprachliche Kriterien für die Chronologie der Platonischen Dialoge', *Hermes* 16: 321–45.
- Dobree, P. P. (pre-1825) manuscript notes published posthumously in his *Adversaria*, 2 vols. (ed. J. Scholefield; Cambridge 1831–3) II 42–5, the pagination of which I cite.
- Dobrov, G. W. (2010) (ed.) *Brill's Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy* (Leiden).
- Dodds, E. R. (1951) *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Sather Classical Lectures 25; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- Dorsch, K.-D. (1983) *Götterhymnen in den Chorliedern der griechischen Tragiker – Form, Inhalt und Funktion* (diss. Münster).
- Dover, K. J. (1974) *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford).
(1976) 'ΗΛΙΟΣ ΚΗΡΥΞ (Soph. *Trach.* 97–102)', in Bremer *et al.* (1976) 49–53.
[= (1987) 186–9]
(1987) *Greek and the Greeks. Collected Papers*, vol. 1: *Language, Poetry, Drama* (Oxford).
(1997) *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford).
- Dunn, F. M. (2000) 'Euripidean aetiologies', *CB* 76: 3–27.
- Dürbeck, H. (1977) *Zur Charakteristik der griechischen Farbenbezeichnungen* (Habelts Dissertationsdrucke Reihe klassische Philologie 27; Bonn).
- Easterling, P. E. (1967) 'Sophocles' *Ajax*: collations of the manuscripts G, R, and Q', *CQ* N.S. 17: 52–79.
(1984) 'The tragic Homer', *BICS* 31: 1–8.
(1985) 'Anachronism in Greek tragedy', *JHS* 105: 1–10.
(1993a) 'Tragedy and ritual', in Scodel (1993) 7–23.
(1993b) 'Gods on stage in Greek tragedy', in Dalfen *et al.* (1993) 77–86.
(1994) review of Ll-J/W, Sophocles OCT, *JHS* 114: 186–8.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- (1996) 'Weeping, witnessing, and the tragic audience: response to Segal', in Silk (1996) 173–81.
- (1997a) (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- (1997b) 'A show for Dionysus', in (1997a) 36–53.
- (2002) 'Actor as icon', in Easterling and Hall (2002) 327–41.
- (2008) 'Theatrical Furies: thoughts on *Eumenides*', in Revermann and Wilson (2008) 219–36.
- Easterling, P. E., and Hall, E. M. (2002) (eds.) *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession* (Cambridge).
- Ebbott, M. (2003) *Imagining Illegitimacy in Classical Greek Literature* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford).
- Ehwald, R. et al. (1905) *Festschrift Albert von Bamberg zum 1. Oktober 1905 gewidmet vom Lehrerkollegium des Gymnasium Ernestinum zu Gotha* (Gotha).
- Eitrem, S. (1912) 'Varia', *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi* Fjerde Raekke 1: 69–73, 104–8.
- Eldik, E. H. van (1764) *Suspicionum Specimen* (Zutphen). [= Schaefer (1802) 173–222]
- Eliot, C. W. J. (1962) *Coastal Demes of Attica. A Study of the Policy of Kleisthenes* (Phoen. Suppl. 5; Toronto).
- Elmsley, P. (1811a) review of R. Porson (ed.) *Euripidis Hecuba* (London 1808), *The Edinburgh Review* vol. 19 no. 37: 64–95.
- (1811b) 'Appendix', *The Edinburgh Review* vol. 17 no. 34: 491–4.
- (1812) review of J. Markland (ed.) *Euripidis Supplices Mulieres* (Oxford 1811) and *Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide et in Tauris* (Oxford 1811), *Quarterly Review* vol. 7 no. 14: 441–64.
- (1813a) review of J. G. J. Hermann (ed.) *Euripidis Hercules Furens* (Leipzig 1810), *Classical Journal* vol. 8 no. 15: 199–218.
- (1813b) review of J. G. J. Hermann (ed.) *Euripidis Supplices* (Leipzig 1811), part 1, *Classical Journal* vol. 8 no. 16: 417–40.
- (1814) 'Notes on the *Ajax* of Sophocles', *Museum Criticum* 3: 351–69 and 4: 469–88.¹¹
- Else, G. F. (1939) 'Aristotle and satyr-play. I', *TAPA* 70: 139–57.
- (1957) *Aristotle's Poetics. The Argument* (Cambridge, MA).
- Enger, R. (1853a) 'Ueber Sophokles' Aias 578 ff.', *Philologus* 8: 160–6.
- (1853b) 'Ueber zwei Scenen im Aias des Sophokles', *RhM* n.F. 8: 211–20.
- (1860) 'Die tragödien des Sophokles', *Philologus* 15: 92–127.
- Erbse, H. (1986) *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 24; Berlin and New York).

¹¹ Pagination from Cambridge 1826 reprint, itself reprinted Bristol 2004; for the date of the original publication see Stray (2004) 298.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Erbse, H. *et al.* (1956) *Festschrift Bruno Snell zum 60. Geburtstag am 18. Juni 1956 von Freunden und Schülern überreicht* (Munich).
- Erp Taalman Kip, A. M. van (1971) *Agamemnon in epos en tragedie. De persoonsuitbeelding als component van het epische en dramatische werk* (Bibliotheca Classica Vangorcumiana 18; Assen).
- (1996) 'Truth in tragedy: when are we entitled to doubt a character's words?', *AJP* 117: 517–36.
- (2007) 'Athena's one-day limit in Sophocles' *Aias*', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 60: 464–71.
- Faraone, C. A. (1999) *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- Farron, S. (2003) 'Attitudes to military archery in the *Iliad*', in Basson and Dominik (2003) 169–84.
- Fehling, D. (1969) *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin).
- (1974) *Ethologische Überlegungen auf dem Gebiet der Altertumskunde. Phallische Demonstration – Fernsicht – Steinigung* (Zetemata 61; Munich).
- Ferrari, F. (1983) *Ricerche sul testo di Sofocle* (Studi di lettere, storia e filosofia 34; Pisa).
- (1984) 'Funzioni espressive e critica del testo (a proposito di una recente revisione del testo di Sofocle)', *Maia* n.s. 36: 231–8.
- Ferrari, F. *et al.* (1992) 'In margine al testo di Sofocle', *RFIC* 120: 388–410.
- Fick, A. (1885–6) *Die Homerische Ilias nach ihrer entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt* (Göttingen).
- Finglass, P. J. (2005a) 'Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1427–8', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 58: 561–4.
- (2005b) 'Autocastration or regicide? Lucian, *De Dea Syria* 20', *CQ* n.s. 55: 629–32.
- (2005c) 'Is there a *polis* in Sophocles' *Electra*?', *Phoenix* 59: 199–209.
- (2006a) 'The hero's quest in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *Prometheus* 32: 217–24.
- (2006b) 'The ending of *Iliad* 7', *Philologus* 150: 187–97.
- (2006c) 'The interpolated curse', *Hermes* 134: 257–68.
- (2007a) 'A newly-discovered edition of Sophocles by Peter Elmsley', *GRBS* 47: 101–16.
- (2007b) 'νῦν and νῦν in Pindar', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 60: 269–73.
- (2008) 'Laurentianus 31.10 and the text of Sophocles', *CQ* n.s. 58: 441–51.
- (2009a) 'Unveiling Tecmessa', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 62: 272–82.
- (2009b) 'Unpublished conjectures at Leiden on the Greek dramatists', *GRBS* 49: 187–221.
- (2009c) 'Two amputations in Sophocles', *MD* 62: 223–30.
- (2009d) 'The ending of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*', *Philologus* 153: 42–62.
- (2009e) 'Sophocles' Tecmessa: characterisation and textual criticism', *Eikasmos* 20: 85–96.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- (2009f) 'Interpolation and responson in Sophocles' *Ajax*', *CQ*N.s. 59: 335–52.
 (2009g) 'Orthographica Sophoclea', *Philologus* 153: 206–28.
 (2011a) '*Ajax*', in Markantonatos (2011).
 (2011b) 'Unpublished conjectures on Sophocles by Jeremiah Markland', *GRBS* 51.
 Finglass, P. J., Collard, C., and Richardson, N. J. (2007) (eds.) *Hesperos. Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford).
 Finkelberg, M. (1998) '*Timē* and *Aretē* in Homer', *CQ*N.s. 48: 14–28.
 Firnhaber, C. G. (1853) 'Sophoclea', *Philologus* 8: 738–50.
 Fisher, N. R. E. (1992) *Hybris. A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece* (Warminster).
 Fitzpatrick, D. (2000) 'Initial entrances in three Sophoclean tragedies', in Hardwick *et al.* (2000) 137–52.
 Flory, S. (1978) 'Medea's right hand: promises and revenge', *TAPA* 108: 69–74.
 Foley, H. P. (2003) 'Choral identity in Greek tragedy', *CP* 98: 1–30.
 Fontenrose, J. E. (1959) *Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
 Forbes, R. J. (1950) *Metallurgy in Antiquity. A Notebook for Archaeologists and Technologists* (Leiden).
 Fowler, R. L. (2006) 'Euripides *Bacchae* 135–42', *ŽPE* 158: 43–8.
 Fraenkel, E. D. M. (1920) 'Zur Form der αἶνοι', *RhM* n.F. 73: 366–70. [= (1964) 1 235–9]
 (1931) 'Der Zeushymnus im Agamemnon des Aischylos', *Philologus* 86: 1–17. [= (1964) 1 353–69]
 (1933) 'Kolon und Satz. Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes II', *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 319–54. [= (1964) 1 93–130]
 (1957) *Horace* (Oxford).
 (1959) 'Zum Text der Vögel des Aristophanes', in Dahlmann and Merkelbach (1959) 9–30. [= (1964) 1 427–51]
 (1960) *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Il Pensiero storico 41; transl. F. Munari; Florence). [German original 1922]
 (1962) *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* (Rome).
 (1963) 'Sophokles Aias 68–70', *MH* 20: 103–6. [= (1964) 1 409–13]
 (1964) *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, 2 vols. (Rome).
 (1967a) 'Zwei Aias-Szenen hinter der Bühne', *MH* 24: 79–86.
 (1967b) 'Anreden an nur gedachte Zuhörer' *MH* 24: 190–3.
 (1977) *Due seminari romani di Eduard Fraenkel* (Sussidi Eruditi 28; ed. L. E. Rossi; Rome).
 (1983) 'Un veterano per "Aiace" (dai pomeriggi di Bari '66)', *Belfagor* 38: 433–51.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (2007a) *Pindaro Sofocle Terenzio Catullo Petronio. Edizione Accresciuta con Aristofane e Plauto. Corsi seminariali* – Bari 1965–69² (Sussidi Eruditi 43; ed. R. Roncali; Rome). [1st edn 1994]
- (2007b) *Plautine Elements in Plautus* (translated by F. Muecke and T. Drevikovsky; Oxford).
- Fraenkel, E(rnst) (1910–12) *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf -τήρ, -τωρ, -της (-τ-)*, 2 vols. (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 1; Strassburg).
- Fränkel, H. (1930a) ‘Parmenidesstudien’, *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 153–92. [= (1968) 157–97]
- (1968) *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens. Literarische und philosophiegeschichtliche Studien*³ (ed. F. Tietze; Munich). [1st edn 1955]
- Friedländer, P. (1938a) ‘Geschichtswende im Gedicht. Interpretationen historischer Epigramme’, *SIFC* 15: 89–120. [= (1969) 213–36]
- (1938b) ‘Δις καὶ τρίς τὸ καλόν’, *TAPA* 69: 375–80. [= (1969) 206–9]
- (1969) *Studien zur antiken Literatur und Kunst* (Berlin).
- Friis Johansen, H. (1959) *General Reflection in Tragic Rhexis. A Study of Form* (Copenhagen).
- Gaertner, J. F. (2007a) (ed.) *Writing Exile. The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond* (Mnem. Suppl. 283; Leiden and Boston).
- (2007b) ‘The discourse of displacement in Greco-Roman antiquity’, in (2007a) (ed.) 1–20.
- Gardiner, C. P. (1979) ‘The staging of the death of Ajax’, *CJ* 75: 10–14.
- (1987) *The Sophoclean Chorus. A Study of Character and Function* (Iowa City).
- Garland, R. (1985) *The Greek Way of Death* (Ithaca, NY).
- Garriga, C. (2006) ‘Aiace in Eschilo (fr. 451q dubium Radt)’, *Lexis* 24: 233–45.
- Garulli, V. (2007) ‘Una glossa Alessandrina in Posidipp. 46, 4 A.–B.: sulla famiglia di παιπάλειος’, *Paideia* 62: 411–28.
- Garvie, A. F. (2005) *The Plays of Sophocles* (London).
- Gasche, H., and Hrouda, B. (1996) (eds.) *Collectanea Orientalia. Histoire, arts de l’espace et industrie de la terre. Études offertes en hommage à Agnès Spycket* (Civilisations du Proche-Orient série 1; Archéologie et Environnement 3; Neuchâtel).
- Gasti, H. (1992) ‘Sophocles’ *Ajax*: the military *hybris*’, *QUCC* n.s. 40: 81–93.
- Gebauer, J., Grabow, E., Jünger, F., and Metzler, D. (2004) (eds.) *Bildergeschichte. Festschrift für Klaus Stähler* (Möhnesee).
- Geel, J. (1853) ‘Sophocles, Ajax, vs. 646–692’, *Mnemosyne* 2: 200–8.
- Gentili, B., and Perusino, F. (1999) (eds.) *La colometria antica dei testi poetici greci* (Incontri e seminari 1; Pisa and Rome).
- Gerber, D. E. (1975) ‘Mimnermus, fragment 2.4–5’, *GRBS* 16: 263–8.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- (1984) (ed.) *Greek Poetry and Philosophy. Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico, CA).
- Gerhard, Y. (1978) 'Ἀτρυτώνη', *IJgrE* 9: 1518–19.
- Gigon, O. et al. (1946) *Phyllobolia für Peter Von der Mühl zum 60. Geburtstag am 1. August 1945* (Basel).
- Gill, C. (1996) *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy. The Self in Dialogue* (Oxford).
- Gill, C., Postlethwaite, N., and Seaford, R. A. S. (1998) (eds.) *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford).
- Gilleland, M. E. (1980) 'Female speech in Greek and Latin', *AJP* 101: 180–3.
- Gnioli, G., and Vernant, J.-P. (1982) (eds.) *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes* (Cambridge and Paris).
- Goette, H. R. (2000) 'Ὁ ἀξιόλογος δῆμος Σούνιον'. *Landeskundliche Studien in Südost-Attika* (Internationale Archäologie 59; Rahden).
- Golder, H. (1990) 'Sophocles' *Ajax*: beyond the shadow of time', *Arion* 3rd ser. 1: 9–34.
- (1992) 'Visual meaning in Greek drama: Sophocles' *Ajax* and the art of dying', in Poyatos (1992) 323–60.
- Goldhill, S. D. (1986) *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- (1987) 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', *JHS* 107: 58–76.
- (1990) 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) 97–129. [Revision of (1987)]
- (2009) 'Undoing in Sophoclean drama: *lusis* and the analysis of irony', *TAPA* 139: 21–52.
- Goldhill, S. D., and Osborne, R. (1999) (eds.) *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge).
- Gonda, J. (1929) *Δείκνυμι. Semantische Studie over den Indo-Germaanschen Wortel DEIK-* (diss. Utrecht; Amsterdam).
- Gonzales, M. (2008) 'New observations on the Lindian cult-tax for Enyalios (SEG 4.171)', *ζPE* 166: 121–34.
- Görler, W. (1963) *MENANΔΡΟΥ ΓΝΩΜΑΙ* (diss. Berlin).
- Gould, J. P. A. (1973) 'Hiketeia', *JHS* 93, 74–103. [= (2001) 22–77, with addendum]
- (1980) 'Law, custom and myth: aspects of the social position of women in classical Athens', *JHS* 100: 38–59. [= (2001) 112–57]
- (2001) *Myth, Ritual, Memory, and Exchange. Essays in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford).
- Goward, B. (1999) *Telling Tragedy. Narrative Technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides* (London).
- Grandolini, S. (2005) (ed.) *Lirica e teatro in Grecia. Il testo e la sua ricezione. Atti del II incontro di studi Perugia, 23–24 gennaio 2003* (Università degli Studi di

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Perugia Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia e Tradizione Greca e Latina 4; Naples).
- Grenfell, B. P., and Hunt, A. S. (1919) '1615. Sophocles, *Ajax*', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 13: 162–3 with plate 4.
- Grethlein, J. (2007) 'The poetics of the bath in the *Iliad*', *HSCP* 103: 25–49.
- Griffin, J. (1977) 'The Epic Cycle and the uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97: 39–53. [= Cairns (2001) 365–84]
- (1980) *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
- (1999a) (ed.) *Sophocles Revisited. Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- (1999b) 'Sophocles and the democratic city', in (1999a) 73–94.
- (2007) 'Desperate straits and the tragic stage', in Finglass *et al.* (2007) 189–203.
- Griffith, M. (1977) *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge).
- (1978) 'Euripides *Alkestis* 636–641', *HSCP* 82: 83–6.
- (1998) 'The king and eye: the rule of the father in Greek tragedy', *PCPS* n.s. 44: 20–84.
- Gronewald, M. (1987) '251. Sophokles, *Aias* 1–11', *Kölner Papyri* 6: 127–8.
- (1995) 'Bemerkungen zu Menander', *ŽPE* 107: 57–9.
- Grossmann, G. (1968) 'Das Lachen des Aias', *MH* 25: 65–85.
- Gruen, E. S. (2005) (ed.) *Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity* (Oriens et Occidens 8; Stuttgart).
- Guarisco, D. (2001) "'Comparare il comparabile". Artemide e i riti di passaggio: *Brauronia*, *Mounichia*, *Orthia*', in Così (2001) 65–87.
- Güntert, H. (1921) *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister. Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Homerischen und Eddischen Göttersprache* (Halle).
- Gygli-Wyss, B. (1966) *Das nominale Polyptoton im älteren Griechisch* (Ergänzungsheft zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiet der indogermanischen Sprachen 18; Göttingen).
- Hall, E. M. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford).
- (1999) 'Actor's song in tragedy', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) 96–122. [≈ (2006) 288–320]
- (2006) *The Theatrical Cast of Athens. Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society* (Oxford).
- Halleran, M. R. (1992) 'Sophocles, *Ajax* 430 ff.', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 45: 358–9.
- Halliwell, S. (1995) 'Forms of address: Socratic vocatives in Plato', in De Martino and Sommerstein (1995) 11 87–121.
- (2008) *Greek Laughter. A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity* (Cambridge).
- Halm-Tisserant, M. (1986) 'Le gorgonéion, emblème d'Athéna. Introduction du motif sur le bouclier et l'égide', *Revue Archéologique* 245–78.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Hamm, E.-M. (1958) *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*² (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst Jahrgang 1951 nr. 2; Berlin). [1st edn 1957]
- Hansen, M. H. (1999) *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes. Structure, Principles, and Ideology*² (transl. J. A. Crook; London). [1st edn Oxford and Cambridge, MA 1991]
- (2005) (ed.) *The Imaginary Polis. Symposium, January 7–10, 2004* (Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 7; Copenhagen).
- Hanson, V. D. (1991) (ed.) *Hoplites. The Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London and New York).
- Hardwick, L., et al. (2000) (eds.) *Theatre: Ancient and Modern. Selected Proceedings of a Two-Day International Research Conference hosted by the Department of Classical Studies on 5th and 6th January, 1999, at The Open University, Milton Keynes* (Milton Keynes).
- Harries, H. (1891) *Tragici Graeci qua arte usi sint in describenda insania* (diss. Kiel).
- Harris, E. M., Leão, D. F., and Rhodes, P. J. (2010) *Law and Drama in Ancient Greece* (London).
- Harrison, E. (1941) 'Interlinear hiatus in Greek tragic trimeters', *CR* 55: 22–5.
- (1943) 'Interlinear hiatus in tragic trimeters, II', *CR* 57: 61–3.
- Harwood, E. (1790) *A View of the Various Editions of the Greek and Roman Classics*⁴ (London). [1st edn 1775]
- Haslam, M. W. (1979) 'O suitably-attired-in-leather-boots. Interpolations in Greek tragedy', in Bowersock et al. (1979) 91–100.
- Haubold, J. (2000) *Homer's People. Epic Poetry and Social Formation* (Cambridge).
- Heath, B. (1762) *Notae sive lectiones ad Sophoclem*, in *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschylī Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias* (Oxford).
- Heath, M. F. (1987) *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy* (Stanford).
- (2007) review of books on Greek literature, *G&R* 2nd ser. 54: 111–16.
- Heath, M. F., and O'Kell, E. R. (2007) 'Sophocles' *Ajax*: expect the unexpected', *CQ* n.s. 57: 363–80.
- Hecquet-Devienne, M. (1994) 'Lecture nouvelle de l'*Oedipe Roi* de Sophocle dans les manuscrits *L* et *A*', *RHT* 24: 1–59.
- Hedreen, G. (2001) *Capturing Troy. The Narrative Functions of Landscape in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Art* (Ann Arbor).
- Heiden, B. (2008) 'Common people and leaders in *Iliad* book 2: the invocation of the Muses and the Catalogue of Ships', *TAPA* 138: 127–54.
- Heimsoeth, F. (1865) *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern. Erste Abteilung. Eine nothwendige Ergänzung der kritischen Methode* (Bonn).
- Heinz, J. (1937) 'Zur Datierung der Trachinierinnen', *Hermes* 72: 270–300.
- Heitsch, E. (1965) *Aphroditehymnos, Aeneas und Homer. Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum Homerproblem* (Hypomnemata 15; Göttingen).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Henrichs, A. (1976) 'Despoina Kybele: ein Beitrag zur religiösen Namenkunde', *HSCP* 80: 253–86.
- (1993) 'The tomb of Aias and the prospect of hero cult in Sophokles', *CA* 12: 165–80.
- (2000) 'Drama and *dromena*: bloodshed, violence, and sacrificial metaphor in Euripides', *HSCP* 100: 173–88.
- (2004) "'Let the good prevail": perversions of the ritual process in Greek tragedy', in Yatromanolakis and Roilos (2004) 189–98.
- Hermann, J. G. J. (1796) *De Metris Poetarum Graecorum et Romanorum Libri III* (Leipzig).
- (1802) *Francisci Vigeri Rotomagensis De Praecipuis Graecae Dictionis Idiotismis Liber cum Animadversionibus Henrici Hoozeveeni et Ioannis Caroli Zeunii. Edidit et Adnotationes addidit Godofredus Hermannus* (Leipzig).
- (1808) 'Dissertatio de ellipsi et pleonasmo in Graeca lingua', in Wolf and Buttmann (1808) 95–235. [= (1827) 148–244]
- (1827) *Opuscula. Volumen Primum* (Leipzig).
- (1838) review of three works by Wunder, *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* ('Zimmermann's Zeitschrift') 5: 358–419.
- Hermay, A., Cassimatis, H., and Vollkommer, R. (1986) 'Eros', *LLMC* III/1: 850–942.
- Hertel, F. T. (1856) *Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen über einige Stellen des Sophokles* (Progr. Torgau).
- Herwerden, H. van (1862) *Exercitationes Criticae in Poeticis et Prosaicis quibusdam Atticorum Monumentis* (The Hague).
- (1868) *Analecta Critica ad Thucydidem, Lysiam, Sophoclem, Aristophanem et Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Utrecht).
- (1880) *Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia* (Utrecht).
- (1882) 'Ad comicos Graecos', *Mnemosyne* n.s. 10: 67–95.
- (1886) 'Ad poetas Graecos', *Mnemosyne* n.s. 14: 19–64.
- (1887) *Lucubrationes Sophocleae* (Utrecht).
- Herzog, R. (1894) 'Ἀέννος (Zu Archil. fr. 65)', *Philologus* 52: 204–5.
- Hesk, J. (2003) *Sophocles. Ajax* (London).
- Heusinger, M. I. F. (1745) *Codicis M. S. qui Aiaceum et Electram Sophoclis continet brevem descriptionem et in eisdem tragoediis observationum specimen...* (Jena).
- Hillgruber, M. (2000) 'Die Kunst der Verstellten Rede. Ein vernachlässigtes Kapitel der antiken Rhetorik', *Philologus* 144: 3–21.
- Hirzel, R. R. (1910) *Die Talion* (Philol. Suppl. 11/4: 405–82).
- Hodkinson, S. J. (2005) 'The imaginary Spartan *politeia*', in Hansen (2005) 222–81.
- Hodkinson, S. J., and Powell, A. (1999) (eds.) *Sparta. New Perspectives* (London).
- Hoff, R. von den, and Schmidt, S. (2001) (eds.) *Konstruktionen von Wirklichkeit. Bilder im Griechenland des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v Chr.* (Stuttgart).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Hofmann, H. (1991) (ed.) *Fragmenta Dramatica. Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte* (Festschrift Radt; Göttingen).
- Hogan, R. (1997) *The Dramatic Function of Antilabe in Greek Tragedy* (M.Litt. diss. Trinity College, Dublin).
- Holt, P. (1992) 'Ajax's burial in early Greek epic', *AJP* 113: 319–31.
- Hooker, J. T. (1968) 'The sacrifice of Iphigeneia in the *Agamemnon*', *ΑΓΩΝ* (Journal of Berkeley graduate students) 2: 59–65. [= (1996) 563–9]
- (1980) 'The meaning of ἐκλυον at ζ 185', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94: 140–6. [= (1996) 475–81]
- (1996) *Scripta Minora. Selected Essays on Minoan, Mycenaean, Homeric and Classical Greek Subjects* (ed. F. Amory, P. Considine, S. Hooker; Amsterdam).
- Hose, M. (2006) 'Vaticinium post eventum and the position of the *Supplices* in the Danaid trilogy', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) 91–8.
- Housman, A. E. (1892) 'Sophoclea', *JPh* 20: 25–48. [= (1972) 1209–26]
- (1972) *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, 3 vols. (ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear; Cambridge).
- Hübner, S. R. and Ratzan, D. M. (2009a) (eds.) *Growing up Fatherless in Antiquity* (Cambridge).
- (2009b) "'Fatherless antiquity?'" Perspectives on "fatherlessness" in the ancient Mediterranean', in (2009a) 3–28.
- Hugoniot, C., Hurlet, F., and Milanezi, S. (2004) (eds.) *Le statut de l'acteur dans l'antiquité grecque et romaine. Actes du colloque qui s'est tenu à Tours les 3 et 4 mai 2002* (Collection perspectives historiques 9; Tours).
- Humble, N. (1999) 'Sōphrosynē and the Spartans in Xenophon', in Hodkinson and Powell (1999) 339–53.
- (2002) 'Sōphrosynē revisited: was it ever a Spartan virtue?', in Powell and Hodkinson (2002) 85–109.
- Humer, E. (2006) *Linkshändigkeit im Altertum. Zur Wertigkeit von links, der linken Hand und Linkshändern in der Antike* (Tönning).
- Hunt, A. S. (1927a) '2093. Sophocles, *Ajax*', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 17: 129–31.
- (1927b) '2077. Sophocles, *Nauplius*?', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 17: 30–5.
- Instone, S. J. (2007) "'Darkness, my light": enigmatic Ajax', in Finglass *et al.* (2007) 228–38.
- Irvine, J. A. D. (1997) 'Euripides' *Ion* l. 1 and Pap. Herc. 1088 2 A reconsidered', *ΣPE* 117: 1–8.
- Itsumi, K. (1982) 'The "choriambic dimeter" of Euripides', *CQ* n.s. 32: 59–74.
- (1984) 'The glyconic in tragedy', *CQ* n.s. 34: 66–82.
- (1991–3) 'Enoplian in tragedy', *BICS* 38: 243–61.
- Jackson, A. H. (1991) 'Hoplites and the gods: the dedication of captured arms and armour', in Hanson (1991) 228–49.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Jackson, J. (1912) 'On certain readings in Sophocles', *CQ* 6: 152–64.
 (1955) *Marginalia Scaenica* (ed. E. D. M. Fraenkel; Oxford).
- Jacobs, F. C. W. (1786) *Specimen Emendationum in Auctores Veteres cum Graecos tum Latinos* (Gotha).
- Jaeger, J. G. (1811) *Annotationes ad Sophoclis Aiace* (Altona).
- Jahn, O. (1869) 'Satura', *Hermes* 3: 175–92.
- Jansen, J. N. (2007) *After Empire. Xenophon's Poroi and the Reorientation of Athens' Political Economy* (diss. Austin, TX).
- Janz, T. J. (2005) *The Scholia to Sophocles' Philoctetes* (diss. Oxford).
- Jenkins, I. (2002) 'The earliest representation in Greek art of the death of Ajax', in Clark and Gaunt (2002) 153–6 with plate 41.
- Jocelyn, H. D. (1970) 'Euripides, *Medea* 108–110', *PCPS* n.s. 16: 42–3.
- Johnson, J. F., and Clapp, D. C. (2005) 'Athenian tragedy: an education in pity', in Sternberg (2005) 123–64.
- Johnston, S. I. (1999) *Restless Dead. Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- Johnston, S. I., and McNiven, T. J. (1996) 'Dionysos and the underworld in Toledo', *MH* 53: 25–36.
- Jones, W. H. S. (1910) 'Homeric optatives in Sophocles', *CR* 24: 118–19.
- Jong, I. J. F. de (1991) *Narrative in Drama. The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech* (Mnem. Suppl. 116; Leiden, New York, Copenhagen, Cologne).
 (2006) 'Where narratology meets stylistics: the seven versions of Ajax' madness', in de Jong and Rijksbaron (2006) 73–93.
 (2007a) 'Sophocles' in de Jong and Nünlist (2007) 275–92.
 (2007b) 'Sophocles *Trachiniae* 1–48, Euripidean prologues, and their audiences', in Allan and Buijs (2007) 7–28.
- Jong, I. J. F. de, and Nünlist, R. (2007) (eds.) *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Mnem. Suppl. 291; Studies in Ancient Greek Literature 2; Leiden and Boston).
- Jong, I. J. F. de, and Rijksbaron, A. (2006) (eds.) *Sophocles and the Greek Language. Aspects of Diction, Syntax and Pragmatics* (Mnem. Suppl. 269; Leiden and Boston).
- Jouanna, J. (1977) 'La métaphore de la chasse dans le prologue de l' "Ajax" de Sophocle', *BAGB* 168–86.
 (1991) 'Sophocle, *Ajax*, v. 747: le savoir du devin ou le savoir du messager?', *REG* 104: 556–63.
- Kahlenberg, W. (1903) *De Paraphrasis Homericae apud Tragicos Poetas Graecos vestigiis quaestiones selectae* (Strassburg).
- Kaimio, M. (1970) *The Chorus of Greek Drama within the Light of the Person and Number Used* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 46; Helsinki).
 (1977) *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 53; Helsinki).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- (1988) *Physical Contact in Greek Tragedy. A Study of Stage Conventions* (Helsinki).
- (2002) 'Erotic experience in the conjugal bed: good wives in Greek tragedy', in Nussbaum and Sihvola (2002) 95–119.
- Kakridis, J. T. (1949) *Homeric Researches* (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 45; Lund). [Greek original 1944]
- (1978) 'Pleistheniden oder Atriden? Zu Hesiods frg. 195 M.–W.', *ΣΡΕ* 30: 1–4.
- (1981) 'Zur epischen Onomatologie', in Kurz *et al.* (1981) 47–52.
- Kalén, T. (1941) *Selbständige Finalsätze und imperativische Infinitive im Griechischen* (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala 34/2; Uppsala and Leipzig).
- Kamen, D. (2009) 'Servile invective in classical Athens', *SCI* 28: 43–56.
- Kamerbeek, J. C. (1950) 'Sophoclea III', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 3: 12–20.
- Kane, R. L. (1996) 'Ajax and the sword of Hector. Sophocles, "Ajax" 815–822', *Hermes* 124: 17–28.
- Kapparis, K. (1995) 'When were the Athenian adultery laws introduced?', *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3^e sér. 42: 97–122.
- Karadagli, T. (1981) *Fabel und Ainos. Studien zur griechischen Fabel* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 135; Königstein).
- Kassel, R. (1954) *Quomodo quibus locis apud veteres scriptores graecos infantes atque parvuli pueri inducantur describantur commemorantur* (diss. Würzburg; Meisenheim am Glan). [= (1991) 1–73]
- (1958) *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur* (Zetemata 18; Munich).
- (1979) 'Ein neues Philemonfragment', *ΣΡΕ* 36: 15–21. [= (1991) 303–9]
- (1991) *Kleine Schriften* (ed. H.-G. Nesselrath; Berlin and New York).
- Katz, J. T. (2004) 'The "swimming duck" in Greek and Hittite', in Penney (2004) 195–216.
- Kayser, C. L. (1839) *Sophoclis Ajax, Electra, Oedipus Rex emendatae et illustratae ex codicibus Palatinis XL et CCCLVI* (Acta Seminarii Philologici Heidelbergensis Fasciculus 1; Heidelberg).
- Kearns, E. (1989) *The Heroes of Attica* (BICS Suppl. 57; London).
- Keen, A. G. (2005) 'Lycians in the *Cares* of Aeschylus', in McHardy *et al.* (2005) 63–82.
- Kelly, A. D. (2007) *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Iliad VIII* (Oxford).
- Keyßner, K. (1932) *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus* (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft 2; Stuttgart).
- Kieckers, E. (1915) 'Zur oratio recta in den indogermanischen Sprachen I', *IF* 35: 1–93.
- Kiefner, G. (1964) *Die Versparung. Untersuchungen zu einer Stilfigur der dichterischen Rhetorik am Beispiel der griechischen Tragödie (unter Berücksichtigung des σχῆμα ἀπὸ κοινοῦ)* (Klassisch-philologische Studien 25; Wiesbaden).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kienzle, E. (1936) *Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern in der älteren griechischen Dichtung* (diss. Kallmünz).
- Killen, J. T., Melena, J. L., and Olivier, J.-P. (1987) (eds.) *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek presented to John Chadwick* (Minos n.s. 20–2; Salamanca).
- Kirkwood, G. M. (1965) 'Homer and Sophocles' *Ajax*', in Anderson (1965) 53–70.
- Kitto, H. D. F. (1939) 'Sophocles, statistics, and the *Trachiniae*', *AJP* 60: 178–93.
(1966) review of Knox (1964), *JHS* 86: 175–6.
- Klausen, R. H. (1834) review of K. O. Müller (ed.), *Aeschylus Eumeniden* (Göttingen 1833), *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* ('Zimmermann's Zeitschrift') 1: 318–50.
- Kleingünther, A. (1933) *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung* (Philol. Suppl. 26.1; Leipzig).
- Klibansky, R., and Paton, H. J. (1936) (eds.) *Philosophy and History. Essays presented to Ernst Cassirer* (Oxford).
- Kloft, H. (1988) (ed.) *Sozialmassnahmen und Fürsorge. Zur Eigenart antiker Sozialpolitik* (Grazer Beiträge Suppl. 3; Graz and Horn).
- Knox, B. M. W. (1961) 'The *Ajax* of Sophocles', *HSCP* 65: 1–37. [= (1979) 125–60]
(1964) *The Heroic Temper. Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Sather Classical Lectures 35; Berkeley and Los Angeles).
(1966) 'Second thoughts in Greek tragedy', *GRBS* 7: 213–32. [= (1979) 231–49]
(1972) 'Aeschylus and the third actor', *AJP* 93: 104–24. [= (1979) 39–55]
(1979) *Word and Action. Essays on the Ancient Theatre* (Baltimore and London).
(1983) 'Sophocles and the *polis*', in de Romilly (1983) 1–27.
- Konow, S. et al. (1924) *ΑΝΤΙΔΩΡΟΝ. Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres am 11. Dezember 1923 gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen* (Göttingen).
- Konstan, D. (1998) 'Reciprocity and friendship', in Gill et al. (1998) 279–301.
- Kopff, E. C. (1993) review of Ll-J/W, Sophocles OCT and Davies's *Trachiniae*, *AJP* 114: 155–63.
- Kossatz-Deissmann, A. (1981) 'Achilleus', *LIMC* 1/1: 37–200.
- Koster, W. J. W. (1959) 'De codicis Par. gr. 2712 aetate', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 12: 135.
- Kousis, E. T. (1891) 'Σημειώσεις κριτικά καὶ ἐρμηνευτικά εἰς Αἴαντα Σοφοκλέους', *Ἀθήνα. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθηναῖς ἐπιστημονικῆς ἐταιρείας* 3: 197–211.
- Kovacs, P. D. (1987) *The Heroic Muse. Studies in the Hippolytus and Hecuba of Euripides* (AJP Monographs in Classical Philology 2; Baltimore and London).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Kowalzig, B. (2006) 'The aetiology of empire? Hero-cult and Athenian tragedy', in Davidson *et al.* (2006) 79–98.
- Kranz, W. (1933) *Stasimon. Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie* (Berlin).
- (1955) *Kosmos* (Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte 2/1; Bonn).
- Krause, J. (1976) *ΑΛΛΟΤΕ ΑΛΛΟΣ. Untersuchungen zum Motiv des Schicksalswechsels in der griechischen Dichtung bis Euripides* (Tuduv Studien 4; Munich).
- Krauss, J. (1850) *Quaestiones Terentianae Criticae* (diss. Bonn).
- Krentz, P. (1991) 'The *salpinx* in Greek warfare', in Hanson (1991) 110–20.
- Kroll, J. (1932) *Gott und Hölle. Der Mythos vom Descensuskampfe* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 20; Leipzig and Berlin).
- Kron, U. (1976) *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen. Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellungen* (Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung 5; Berlin).
- Krüger, G. (1870) 'Zu Sophokles', *RhM* n.F. 25: 442–3.
- Kugler, L. (1905) *De Sophoclis quae vocantur abusonibus* (diss. Göttingen).
- Kullmann, W. (1960) *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis)* (Hermes Einzelschriften 14; Wiesbaden).
- Kuntz, M. (1993) *Narrative Setting and Dramatic Poetry* (Mnem. Suppl. 124; Leiden, New York, Cologne).
- Kurt, C. (1979) *Seemännische Fachausdrücke bei Homer. Unter Berücksichtigung Hesiods und der Lyriker bis Bakchylides* (Ergänzungsheft zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 28; Göttingen).
- Kurtz, D. C., and Boardman, J. (1971) *Greek Burial Customs* (London and Southampton).
- Kurz, G., Müller, D., and Nicolai, W. (1981) (eds.) *Gnomosyne. Menschliches Denken und Handeln in der frühgriechischen Literatur. Festschrift für Walter Marg zum 70. Geburtstag* (Munich).
- Kvíčala, J. (1862) review of Nauck⁴, *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 13: 398–420.
- Lachmann, K. K. F. W. (1818) review of Hermann's 1st edition, *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* vol. 4 no. 203–4: 249–63. [= (1876) 1–17]
- (1819) *De choricis systematis tragicorum Graecorum libri quattuor* (Berlin).
- (1876) *Kleinere Schriften zur classischen Philologie*, vol. II (Berlin).
- Laird, A. (2006) (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford).
- Laird, A. G. (1922) 'On causal ὄταν', *CQ* 16: 37–43.
- Laks, A. (1982) 'Remarques sur χαίρων ἔθι et les formules apparentées', *Glotta* 60: 214–20.
- Lambert, S. D. (1997) 'The Attic genos Salaminioi and the island of Salamis', *ΣPE* 119: 85–106.
- (1999) 'IG II² 2345, Thiasoi of Herakles and the Salaminioi again', *ΣPE* 125: 93–130.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Lane, E. N. (1996) (ed.) *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults. Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 131; Leiden, New York, Cologne).
- Langdon, S. (2008) *Art and Identity in Dark Age Greece, 1100–700 BCE* (Cambridge).
- Langholf, V. (1977) 'Unmotivierte Partizipien im Griechischen', *Hermes* 105: 290–307.
- Lanza, L., and Fort, L. (1987) 'Note sulla tradizione indiretta sofoclea', *Prometheus* 13: 217–32.
- (1991) *Sofocle. Problemi di tradizione indiretta* (Saggi e materiali universitari 16; Padua).
- Lardinois, A. P. M. H. (2006) 'The polysemy of gnomic expressions and Ajax' deception speech', in de Jong and Rijksbaron (2006) 213–23.
- Laroche, E. (1949) *Histoire de la racine NEM– en grec ancien (νέμω, νέμεσις, νόμος, νομίζω)* (Études et commentaires 6; Paris).
- Lattimore, R. A. (1942) *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 28.1–2; Urbana).
- (1958) *The Poetry of Greek Tragedy* (Baltimore).
- (1979) 'Optatives of consent and refusal', in Bowersock *et al.* (1979) 209–16.
- Lautensach, O. (1899) *Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern. Augment und Reduplikation* (Hannover and Leipzig).
- Lawrence, S. (2005) 'Ancient ethics, the heroic code, and the morality of Sophocles' *Ajax*', *G&R* 2nd ser. 52: 18–33.
- Łazarewicz, B. (1856) *De versibus spuris apud Sophoclem* (Berlin).
- Leeuwen, J. van (1881) *Commentatio de Aiakis Sophoclei authenticia et integritate* (Utrecht).
- Lejeune, M. (1939) *Les Adverbes grecs en –θεν* (diss. Paris; Bordeaux).
- Leo, F. (1908) *Der Monolog im Drama. Ein Beitrag zur griechisch-römischen Poetik* (Abhandlungen der Königlich-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse n.F. Bd. 10 Nr. 5; Berlin).
- (1912) *Plautinische Forschungen. Zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*² (Berlin). [1st edn 1895]
- Létoublon, F. (1992) 'Ce qui n'a plus de nom dans aucune langue', *RPh* 66: 317–35.
- Leumann, M. (1950) *Homerische Wörter* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 3; Basel).
- Ley, G. (1988) 'A scenic plot of Sophocles' *Ajax* and *Philoctetes*', *Eranos* 86: 85–115.
- L'Homme-Wéry, L.-M. (2000) 'Les héros de Salamine en Attique. Cultes, mythes et intégration politique', in Pirenne-Delforge and Suárez de la Torre (2000) 333–49.
- Liapis, V. (1998) 'ΠΟΙΜΕΝΩΝ in Sophocles' "Ajax" 360', *Hermes* 126: 243–50.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Lilja, S. (1976) *Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 56; Helsinki).
- Listmann, G. F. K. (1910) *Die Technik des Dreigesprächs in der griechischen Tragödie* (diss. Gießen; Darmstadt).
- Llewellyn-Jones, L. (2003) *Aphrodite's Tortoise. The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece* (Swansea).
- (2005) 'Body language and the female role player in Greek tragedy and Japanese *Kabuki* theatre', in Cairns (2005a) 73–105.
- Lloyd, A. B. (1997) (ed.) *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity* (London).
- Lloyd, M. A. (1992) *The Agon in Euripides* (Oxford).
- (1999) 'The tragic aorist', *CQ* n.s. 49: 24–45.
- (2007) (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Aeschylus* (Oxford).
- Lloyd, G. E. R. (1962) 'Right and left in Greek philosophy', *JHS* 82: 56–66.
- Lloyd-Jones, P. H. J. (1952) 'The robes of Iphigeneia', *CR* n.s. 2: 132–5.
[= (1990a) 300–4]
- (1956) review of Kamerbeek's 1st edition, *JHS* 76: 111–12.
- (1958) 'Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 393–4', *CR* n.s. 8: 14. [= (1990b) 3]
- (1960) 'Three notes on Aeschylus' Agamemnon', *RhM* n.f. 103: 76–80.
- (1965) 'A problem in the Tebtunis *Inachus*-fragment', *CR* n.s. 15: 241–3.
[= (1990a) 397–400]
- (1966) 'Notes on the *Sikyonios* of Menander', *Emerita* 34: 139–49. [= (1990b) 77–86]
- (1969) review of G. Müller (transl., comm.) *Sophokles. Antigone* (Heidelberg 1967), *CR* n.s. 19: 25–30.
- (1971) review of Diggle's edition of Euripides' *Phaethon*, *CR* n.s. 21: 341–5. [= (1990a) 452–7]
- (1972) 'Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on the dramatic technique of Sophocles', *CQ* n.s. 22: 214–28. [= (1982) 219–37 = (1990a) 401–18]
- (1978) review of Dawe's first edition, vol. 1, *STS* vols. I–II, and A. Colonna (ed.) *Sophocles Fabulae* vol. 1 (Turin 1975), *CR* n.s. 28: 214–21.
- (1983) 'Artemis and Iphigeneia', *JHS* 103: 87–102. [= (1990b) 306–30]
- (1985) 'Sophocles, *Ajax* 624f', in Schäublin (1985) 16–18.
- (1986) review of Dawe's second edition, vol. 1, *CR* n.s. 36: 10–12.
- (1990a) *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- (1990b) *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion, and Miscellanea. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- (1992) 'Helikaon (Sophocles, fr. 10c, 8; fr. 210, 47–53)', *ZPE* 92: 55–8.
[= (2005) 106–9]
- (1993) 'OMMA in Sophocles, *Electra* 902 and *Oedipus Tyrannus* 81' in Most *et al.* (1993) 300–4. [= (2005) 110–14]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1994) 'Notes on fragments of Sophocles', *SIFC* 3° 12: 129–48. [= (2005) 115–35]
- (2005) *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- Lloyd-Jones, P. H. J., and Barns, J. W. B. (1963) 'Un nuovo frammento papiraceo dell'eglia ellenistica', *SIFC* n.s. 35: 205–27. [≈ Lloyd-Jones (1990b) 196–215]
- Lobeck, C. A. (1803) *Specimen Observationum Criticarum et Grammaticarum in Sophoclis Aiaceum Lorarium* (Wittenberg).
- (1829) *Aglaophamus sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis libri tres*, 2 vols. (Königsberg).
- (1837) *Paralipomena Grammaticae Graecae* (Leipzig).
- Lobel, E. (1952) '2257. ὑπόθεσις of a play, etc.', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 20: 66–9.
- Long, A. A. (1964) 'Sophocles *Ajax* 68–70. A reply to Professor Eduard Fraenkel', *MH* 21: 228–31.
- (1968) *Language and Thought in Sophocles. A Study of Abstract Nouns and Poetic Technique* (University of London Classical Studies 6: London).
- Lorimer, E. H. L. (1940) 'Δίπλωτος', *ABSA* 37: 172–86.
- (1947) 'The hoplite phalanx with special reference to the poems of Archilochus and Tyrtaeus', *ABSA* 42: 76–138.
- (1950) *Homer and the Monuments* (London).
- Lourenço, F. (1999) 'A edição Teubneriana de Sófocles', *Euphrosyne* n.s. 27: 453–7.
- Lowe, J. C. B. (1973) 'γ' ᾄρα, γ' ᾄρα and τᾄρα', *Glotta* 51: 34–64.
- (2003) 'The lot-drawing scene of Plautus' *Casina*', *CQ* n.s. 53: 175–83.
- Lowenstam, S. (2008) *As Witnessed by Images. The Trojan War Tradition in Greek and Etruscan Art* (Baltimore).
- Lundgreen, B. (1997) 'A methodological enquiry: the great bronze Athena by Pheidias', *JHS* 117: 190–7.
- Luppe, W. (1974) 'Nochmals zur Choregeninschrift IG II/III² 3091', *APF* 22–3: 211–12.
- Luraghi, N. (2008) *The Ancient Messenians. Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory* (Cambridge).
- Lurje, M. (forthcoming) (ed.) *Tragedy and Archaic Thought*.
- Lynn-George, M. (1993) 'Aspects of the epic vocabulary of vulnerability', *Colby Quarterly* 29: 197–221.
- Maas, P. (1934) review of Adler's edition of the *Suda*, III, *BZ* 34: 164–5.
- (1953) review of Turyn (1952), *Gnomon* 25: 441–2.
- (1960) 'Φιλλυριδης und Verwandtes', *Glotta* 38: 307–8. [= (1973) 229]
- (1973) *Kleine Schriften* (ed. W. Buchwald; Munich).
- MacDowell, D. M. (1995) *Aristophanes and Athens. An Introduction to the Plays* (Oxford).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Macintosh, F. (1994) *Dying Acts. Death in Ancient Greek and Modern Irish Tragic Drama* (Cork).
- Mackay, E. A. (2002) 'The evocation of emotional response in early Greek poetry and painting', in Worthington and Foley (2002) 55–69.
- Macleod, C. W. (1973) 'L'unità dell'Oresteia', *Maia* n.s. 25: 267–92.
(1982) 'Politics and the *Oresteia*', *JHS* 102: 124–44. [= (1983) 20–40; expanded version of (1973)]
(1983) *Collected Essays* (Oxford).
- Madvig, J. N. (1871–84), *Adversaria Critica ad Scriptores Graecos et Latinos*, 3 vols. (Copenhagen).
- Machler, H. (1984) 'Bruchstücke spätantiker Dramenhandschriften aus Hermupolis', *APF* 30: 5–29.
- Magnani, M. (2007) 'Soph. *Ai.* 1190', *Eikasmos* 18: 157–65.
- Mannack, T. (2001) *The Late Mannerists in Athenian Vase-Painting* (Oxford).
- March, J. R. (1991–3) 'Sophocles' *Ajax*: the death and burial of a hero', *BICS* 38: 1–36.
(2000) 'Vases and tragic drama: Euripides' *Medea* and Sophocles' lost *Tereus*', in Rutter and Sparkes (2000) 119–39.
- Marchand, L. A. (1973) *Byron's Letters and Journals. Volume 1. 'In my hot youth', 1798–1810* (London).
- Markantonatos, A. (2011) (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Sophocles* (Leiden).
- Markland, J. (pre-1776) marginalia in his copy of Johnson's edition (London 1758) in the National Art Library, shelfmark Dyce 9298. [See Finglass (2011b).]
- Marshall, C. W. (1994) 'The rule of three actors in practice', *Text and Presentation* 15: 53–61.
(2003) 'Casting the *Oresteia*', *CJ* 98: 257–74.
- Marshall, C. W., and Willigenburg, S. van (2004) 'Judging Athenian dramatic competitions', *JHS* 124: 90–107.
- Martinelli, M. C. (1997) *Gli strumenti del poeta. Elementi di metrica greca*² (Bologna). [1st edn 1995]
- Martinus, B. (1605) *Variarum lectionum libri quatuor. In quibus, aliquot melioris notae auctores, tum Graeci, tum Latini, variis locis explicantur, illustrantur, et a mendis plerisque vindicantur* (Paris).
- Masson, J. (1888) 'A lost edition of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *JPh* 16: 114–23.
- Mastronarde, D. J. (1979) *Contact and Discontinuity. Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage* (Univ. Cal. Publ. in Cl. Stds 21; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
(1988) review of J. Diggle (ed.) *Euripidis Fabulae*, vol. 1 (Oxford 1984), *CP* 83: 151–60.
(1990) 'Actors on high: the skene roof, the crane, and the gods in Attic drama', *CA* 9: 247–94.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Matheson, S. B. (2005) 'A farewell with arms. Departing warriors on Athenian vases', in Barringer and Hurwit (2005) 23–35.
- Mattes, J. (1970) *Der Wahnsinn im griechischen Mythos und in der Dichtung bis zum Drama des fünften Jahrhunderts* (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften n.F. 2 Reihe Band 36; Heidelberg).
- Mazzoldi, S. (2003) 'Struttura e interlocuzione nelle sezioni epirrematiche sofoclee', in Avezzù (2003) 193–208.
- McClure, L. (1999) *Spoken Like a Woman. Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama* (Princeton).
- McGann, J. J. (1986) *Byron* (Oxford and New York).
- McHardy, F., Robson, J., and Harvey, D. (2005) (eds.) *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens. Greek Tragic Fragments* (Exeter).
- McKay, K. J. (1959) 'Studies in *aithon*', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 12: 198–203.
(1961) 'Studies in *aithon* II: Theognis 1209–1216', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 14: 16–22.
- Medda, E. (1993) 'Su alcune associazioni del docmio con altri metri in tragedia (cretico, molosso, baccheo, spondeo, trocheo, coriambo)', *SCO* 43: 101–234.
(1998) "'Abbandonare" o "svenire"? A proposito di Eur. *Or.* 304', *RFIC* 126: 129–36.
(2000) 'Osservazioni su iato e *brevis in longo* nei docmi', *SemRom* 3: 115–42.
- Mehlhorn, <F.> (1845) *Griechische Grammatik für Schulen und Studierende* (Halle).
- Meineck, P. W. (2006) 'Ancient drama illuminated by contemporary stagecraft: some thoughts on the use of mask and *ekkyklēma* in Ariane Mnouchkine's *Le Dernier Caravansérail* and Sophocles' *Ajax*', *AJP* 127: 453–60.
- Meineke, J. A. F. A. (1863) *Analecta Sophoclea* (in an appendix to his edition of *OC*; Berlin).
- Meissner, T. (2006) *S-stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European. A Diachronic Study in Word Formation* (Oxford).
- Metlikovitz, A. (1890) 'De Sophoclis codice Laurentiano Plut. XXXI. 10', *Dissertationes philologiae Vindobonenses* 2: 213–302.
- Metzger, H. (1985) (ed.) *ΕΙΔΩΛΟΠΟΙΙΑ. Actes du Colloque sur les problèmes de l'image dans le monde méditerranéen classique. Château de Lourmarin en Provence: 2–3 septembre 1982* (Archaeologica 61; Rome).
- Meuli, K. (1946) 'Griechische Opferbräuche', in Gigon *et al.* (1946) 185–288.
[= (1975) II 907–1021]
(1954) 'Herkunft und Wesen der Fabel. Ein Vortrag', *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 50: 65–88. [= (1975) II 731–56]
(1967) 'Karl Meuli an Karl Schefold zum 60. Geburtstag am 26. Januar 1965', in Rohde-Liegle *et al.* (1967) 159–61. [= (1975) II 1083–92]
(1975) *Gesammelte Schriften*, 2 vols. (ed. T. Gelzer; Basel and Stuttgart).
- Meyer, M. (1971) *Henrik Ibsen. The Farewell to Poetry. 1864–1882* (London).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Mikalson, J. D. (1989) 'Unanswered prayers in Greek tragedy', *JHS* 109: 81–98.
- Millender, E. G. (2002) 'Herodotus and Spartan despotism', in Powell and Hodkinson (2002) 1–61.
- Miller, M. C. (2005) 'Barbarian lineage in classical Greek mythology and art: Pelops, Danaos and Kadmos', in Gruen (2005) 68–89.
- Minadeo, R. W. (1987) 'Sophocles' Ajax and *kakia*', *Eranos* 85: 19–23.
- Mioni, E. (1982) 'Il codice di Sofocle Marc. Gr. 617', in Alberti *et al.* (1982) 209–16.
- Mitchell, L. G. (2007) *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Swansea).
- Möllendorff, P. von (2001) 'Die Konstruktion von Helden. Rezeptionslenkung durch Intertextualität im "Aias" des Sophokles', in Hoff and Schmidt (2001) 261–79.
- Mommsen, H. (1988) 'Zur Deutung der Exekias-Amphora im Vatikan', in Christiansen and Melander (1988) 445–54.
- Moorhouse, A. C. (1940) 'The construction with MH OY', *CQ* 34: 70–7.
- (1948) 'On negating Greek participles, where the leading verbs are of a type to require μή', *CQ* 42: 35–40.
- (1965) 'A use of οὐδείς and μηδείς', *CQ* n.s. 15: 31–40.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1987) 'Gr. λείσσω and λειπο–: an unsolved problem', in Killen *et al.* (1987) 459–68.
- Morrison, J. S., and Williams, R. T. (1968) *Greek Oared Ships, 900–322 BC* (Cambridge).
- Morstadt, R. A. (1863) *Beiträge zur Exegese und Kritik des Sophokleischen Aias* (Progr. Schaffhausen).
- (1864) *Beiträge zur Exegese und Kritik der Sophokleischen Tragödien Elektra, Aias und Antigone* (Progr. Schaffhausen).
- Morwood, J. (2008) *The Tragedies of Sophocles* (Exeter).
- Mossman, J. M. (1995) *Wild Justice. A Study of Euripides' Hecuba* (Oxford).
- Most, G. W. (1998) (ed.) *Editing Texts. Texte edieren* (Aporemata 2; Göttingen).
- Most, G. W., Petersmann, H., and Ritter, A. M. (1993) (eds.) *Philanthropia kai Eusebeia. Festschrift für Albrecht Dihle zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen).
- Moussy, C. (1969) *Recherches sur τρέφω et les verbes grecs signifiant 'nourrir'* (Études et commentaires 70; Paris).
- Mueller, G. H. (1878) *Emendationes et Interpretationes Sophocleae* (Berlin).
- Mülke, C. (2007) '4807. Sophocles, Ἐπιγονοί', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 71: 15–26.
- Müller, C. W. (1995) 'Der Tod des Sophokles. Datierung und Folgerungen', *RhM* n.F. 138: 97–114. [= (1999b) 196–214]
- (1999a) 'Der "zweite Beweis" als Wahrheitskriterium', *Hermes* 127: 493–5. [= (1999b) 182–5]
- (1999b) *Kleine Schriften zur antiken Literatur und Geistesgeschichte* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 132; Stuttgart and Leipzig).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Müller, D. (1974) *Handwerk und Sprache. Die sprachlichen Bilder aus dem Bereich des Handwerks in der griechischen Literatur bis 400 v. Chr.* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 51; Meisenheim am Glan).
- (1997) *Topographischer Bildkommentar zu den Historien Herodots. Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete mit südostthrakien und Zypern* (Tübingen).
- Müller, K. O. (1838) review of Lobeck's second edition, *GGA* 1083–1113. [= (1847–8) 1 294–312]
- (1847–8) *Kleine Deutsche Schriften über Religion, Kunst, Sprache und Literatur, Leben und Geschichte des Alterthums*, 2 vols. (ed. E. Müller; Breslau).
- Murray, O. (1990) (ed.) *Symptomata. A Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford).
- (1991) 'War and the symposium', in Slater (1991) 83–103.
- Muth, S. (2008) *Gewalt im Bild. Das Phänomen der medialen Gewalt im Athen des 6. und 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Image and Context 1; Berlin and New York).
- Naber, S. A. (1881) 'Sophoclea', *Mnemosyne* n.s. 9: 210–44.
- Nauck, J. A. (1847) 'Parerga critica. Fasciculus II', *Philologus* 2: 144–60.
- (1859–62) *Euripideische studien*, 2 vols. (Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des sciences de Saint-Petersbourg, VII^e sér., 1.12 and 5.6; St Petersburg).
- (1866) 'Kritische Bemerkungen IV', *Mélanges gréco-romains tirés du Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Petersbourg* 2: 639–746. [orig. Nov. 1865].
- (1874) 'Kritische Bemerkungen VI', *Mélanges gréco-romains* ... 3: 207–344. [orig. Oct./Nov. 1871].
- Nes, D. van (1963) *Die maritime Bildersprache des Aischylos* (diss. Utrecht; Groningen).
- Neumann, G. (1965) *Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst* (Berlin).
- (1986) 'Wortbildung und Etymologie von ἑρινύς', *Die Sprache* 32: 43–51.
- Nightingale, A. W. (1995) *Genres in Dialogue. Plato and the Construct of Philosophy* (Cambridge).
- Noort, E., and Tigchelaar, E. (2002) (eds.) *The Sacrifice of Isaac. The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations* (Themes in Biblical Narrative – Jewish and Christian Traditions 4; Leiden, Boston, Cologne).
- Norden, E. (1909) *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*², 2 vols. (Leipzig and Berlin). [1st edn 1898]
- (1913) *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formen-Geschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Nuchelmans, J. (1976) 'Quelques observations sur l'emploi de l'adverbe de modalité ἵσως dans la tragédie grecque', in Bremer *et al.* (1976) 225–47.
- Nünlist, R. (2002) 'Speech within speech in Menander', in Willi (2002) 219–59.
- (2009) 'The motif of the exiled killer', in Dill and Walde (2009) 628–44.
- Nussbaum, M. C., and Sihvola, J. (2002) (eds.) *The Sleep of Reason. Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Chicago and London).
- Nyenhuis, J. E. (1986) 'Daidalos et Ikaros', *LIMC* III/1: 313–21.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Oakley, J. H. (1997) 'Hesione', *LMC* viii/1: 623–9.
- Onians, R. B. (1954) *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time and Fate. New Interpretations of Greek, Roman, and kindred Evidence, also of some basic Jewish and Christian Beliefs*² (Cambridge). [1st edn 1951]
- Ormand, K. (1996) 'Silent by convention? Sophocles' Tekmessa', *AJP* 117: 37–64. [≈ (1999) 104–23]
- (1999) *Exchange and the Maiden. Marriage in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Austin, TX).
- Osann, F. (1820) *Über des Sophokles Aias* (Berlin).
- Osborne, R. (1994) 'Archaeology, the Salaminioi, and the politics of sacred space in archaic Attica', in Alcock and Osborne (1994) (eds.) 143–60.
- Osborne, R., and Hornblower, S. (1994) (eds.) *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts presented to David Lewis* (Oxford).
- Ostwald, M. (1969) *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy* (Oxford).
- Otto, A. (1890) *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig).
- Pachis, P. (1996) "Γαλαῖον Κυβέλης ὀλόλυγμα" (*Anthol. Palat.* vi, 173). L'Élément orgiastique dans le culte de Cybèle', in Lane (1996) 193–222.
- Padel, R. (1974) "Imagery of the elsewhere". Two choral odes of Euripides', *CQ* n.s. 24: 227–41.
- (1992) *In and Out of the Mind. Greek Images of the Tragic Self* (Princeton).
- Padgett, J. M. (2001) 'Ajax and Achilles on a calyx-crater by Euphronios', *Record. Princeton University Art Museum* 60: 3–17.
- Paehler, R. (1892) *Kritische und erklärende Bemerkungen zu Sophokles' Aias* (Wiesbaden).
- Panzer, D. (2005) 'Iterazioni in Sofocle: le sentenze oracolari', in Grandolini (2005) 151–73.
- Papadopoulou, T. (2001) 'Representations of Athena in Greek tragedy', in Deacy and Villing (2001) 293–310.
- (2005) *Heracles and Euripidean Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Pardini, A. (1999) 'Note alla colometria antica dell'*Aiace* di Sofocle', in Gentili and Perusino (1999) 95–120.
- Parker, L. P. E. (1958) 'Some observations on the incidence of word-end in anapaestic paroemiaks and its application to textual questions', *CQ* n.s. 8: 82–9.
- (1966) 'Porson's law extended', *CQ* n.s. 16: 1–26.
- (1968) 'Split resolution in Greek dramatic lyric', *CQ* n.s. 18: 241–69.
- (1976) 'Catalexis', *CQ* n.s. 26: 14–28.
- (1997) *The Songs of Aristophanes* (Oxford).
- Parker, R. C. T. (1983) *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- (1987) 'Myths of early Athens', in Bremmer (1987) 187–214.
- (1996) *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1997) 'Gods cruel and kind: tragic and civic theology', in Pelling (1997a) 143–60.
- (1998) 'Pleasing thighs: reciprocity in Greek religion', in Gill *et al.* (1998) 105–25.
- (1999) 'Through a glass darkly: Sophocles and the divine', in Griffin (1999a) 11–30.
- (2005) *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford).
- Pearce, T. (1996) 'Sophocles, *Ajax* 1023', *RhM* n.F. 139: 351–2.
- Pearson, A. C. (1912a) 'Notes on Sophocles, *Ichneutae*, and *Eurypylos*', *CR* 26: 209–12.
- (1912b) 'On the use of ὅταν with causal implication', *AJP* 33: 426–35.
- (1917) 'Some passages of Greek tragedy', *CQ* 11: 57–68.
- (1919) 'Some glosses in the text of Sophocles', *CQ* 13: 118–26.
- (1920) 'Sophoclea', *CR* 34: 56–7.
- (1922) 'Sophocles, *Ajax*, 961–973', *CQ* 16: 124–36.
- (1923) 'Critical notes on Sophocles and in particular on the *Ajax*', *PCPS* 121–3: 14–28.
- (1929a) 'Sophoclea II', *CQ* 23: 87–95.
- (1929b) 'Sophoclea III', *CQ* 23: 164–76.
- (1930) 'Sophoclea IV', *CQ* 24: 154–63.
- Pelling, C. B. R. (1997a) (ed.) *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford).
- (1997b) 'Aeschylus' *Persae* and history', in (1997a) 1–19.
- (2005) 'Pity in Plutarch', in Sternberg (2005) 277–312.
- (2007) 'Sophocles' learning curve', in Finglass *et al.* (2007) 204–27.
- Penney, J. H. W. (2004) (ed.) *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies* (Oxford).
- Peppink, S. P. (1934) 'De Sophoclis codice Vaticano 1332', *Mnemosyne* 3rd ser. 1: 155–9. [= (1938) 59–63]
- (1938) *Opera Minora Simonis Petri Peppink* (Leiden).
- Perrotta, G. (1935) *Sofocle* (Messina and Milan).
- Perry, B. E. (1940) 'The origin of the epimythium', *TAPA* 71: 391–419.
- Persson, P. (1921–2) 'Wortgeschichtliche Miscellen', *Eranos* 20: 74–90.
- Petersmann, H. (1979) 'Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der motionslosen Partizipia im Griechischen', *Die Sprache* 25: 144–66.
- Petrucione, J. (1983) 'The text of Sophocles' *Ajax* in the Codex Ienensis (Bos. Q 7)', *ŽPE* 53: 37–52.
- Pfeiffer-Petersen, S. (1996) *Konfliktstichomythien bei Sophokles. Funktion und Gestaltung* (Serta Graeca: Beiträge zur Erforschung griechischer Texte 5; Wiesbaden).
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1946) *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford).
- (1968) *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis; Oxford). [1st edn 1953]

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Pierson, J. (1752) *Verisimilium Libri Duo* (Leiden).
- (pre-1759) *Io. Pierson Studia Critica in Scriptores Graecos* (Leiden University Library, BPL 551). [See Finglass (2009b) 205–7.]
- Pipili, M. (1997) 'Thyestes', *LIMC* viii/1: 20–2.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V., and Suárez de la Torre, E. (2000) (eds.) *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs. Actes du Colloque organisé à l'Université de Valladolid du 26 au 29 mai 1999* (Kernos suppl. 10; Liège).
- Platnauer, M. (1960) 'Prodelision in Greek drama', *CQ* n.s. 10: 140–4.
- Platt, A. (1911) 'Sophoclea. IV', *CQ* 5: 24–31.
- Poe, J. P. (1987) *Genre and Meaning in Sophocles' Ajax* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 172; Frankfurt am Main).
- Pöhlmann, E. (1986) 'Bühne und Handlung im Aias des Sophokles', *A&A* 32: 20–32.
- Poli-Palladini, L. (2001) 'Some reflections on Aeschylus' *Aetnae(ae)*', *RhM* n.F. 144: 287–325.
- Polle, F. (1897) 'Zu Sophokles Aias', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 155 = *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 43: 256–60.
- Poole, W. (1994) 'Euripides and Sparta', in Powell and Hodkinson (1994) 1–33.
- Porson, R. (pre-1808a) manuscript notes published posthumously in *Adversaria* (ed. J. H. Monk and C. J. Blomfield; Cambridge 1812), the pagination of which I cite.
- (pre-1808b) manuscript notes published posthumously in *Tracts and Miscellaneous Criticisms of the late Richard Porson, Esq., Regius Greek Professor in the University of Cambridge* (ed. T. Kidd; London 1815), the pagination of which I cite.
- (pre-1808c) manuscript notes published posthumously in *Ricardi Porsoni Notae in Aristophanem* (ed. with additions P. P. Dobree; Cambridge 1820), the pagination of which I cite.
- Postgate, J. P. (1924) 'Sophoclea', *Mnemosyne* n.s. 52: 9–26.
- Powell, A., and Hodkinson, S. J. (1994) (eds.) *The Shadow of Sparta* (London and New York).
- (2002) (eds.) *Sparta. Beyond the Mirage* (London).
- Powell, J. E. (1932) 'A note on Sophocles' *Ajax*', *CR* 46: 155.
- Poyatos, F. (1992) (ed.) *Advances in Nonverbal Communication. Sociocultural, Clinical, Esthetic and Literary Perspectives* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia).
- Pozzi, D. C., and Wickersham, J. M. (1991) (eds.) *Myth and the Polis* (Ithaca and London).
- Praetorius, C. (1873) *Der homerische Gebrauch von ῥ (ῥε) in Fragesätzen* (Progr. Cassel).
- Pratt, L. (2007) 'The parental ethos of the *Iliad*', in Cohen and Rutter (2007) 25–40.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Preiser, G. (1976) *Allgemeine Krankheitsbezeichnungen im Corpus Hippocraticum. Gebrauch und Bedeutung von Nousos und Nosema* (Ars Medica: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Quellenkunde der Alten Medizin 2.5; Berlin and New York).
- Prent, M. (2005) *Cretan Sanctuaries and Cults. Continuity and Change from Late Minoan IIIC to the Archaic Period* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 154; Leiden and Boston).
- Pritchett, W. K. (1955) 'The conditional sentence in Attic Greek', *AJP* 76: 1–17.
- Probert, P. (2003) *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (Bristol).
- (2004) 'Accentuation in old Attic, later Attic, and Attic', in Penney (2004) 277–91.
- (2006) *Ancient Greek Accentuation. Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and Prehistory* (Oxford).
- Pucci, P. (1994) 'Gods' intervention and epiphany in Sophocles', *AJP* 115: 15–46.
- Puelma, M. (1977) 'Sprachliche Beobachtungen zu Catulls Peleus-Epos (C. 64)', *MH* 34: 156–90.
- Puhvel, J. (1970) (ed.) *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans* (UCLA Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology Publications 1; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- Pulleyn, S. J. (1997) *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- Purgold, L. (1802) *Observationes Criticae in Sophoclem, Euripidem, Anthologiam Graecam et Ciceronem* (Jena and Leipzig).
- Pyne, S. J., Andrews, P. L., and Laven, R. D. (1996) *Introduction to Wildland Fire²* (New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, Singapore). [1st edn 1984]
- Quincey, J. H. (1966) 'Greek expressions of thanks', *JHS* 86: 133–58.
- Rabe, B. (2008) *ΤΡΟΠΑΙΑ. τροπή und σκύλα – Entstehung, Funktion und Bedeutung des griechischen Tropaions* (Tübinger Archäologische Forschungen 5; Rahden).
- Race, W. H. (1981) 'The word καιρός in Greek drama', *TAPA* 111: 197–213.
- (1982) *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Mnem. Suppl. 74; Leiden).
- Radermacher, L. (1904) 'Griechischer Sprachbrauch', *Philologus* 63: 1–11.
- Radt, S. L. (1968) 'Ein übersehenes Sophoklesfragment', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 21: 73–4. [= (2002) 40–1]
- (1976) 'Zu Aristophanes' *Plutos*', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 29: 254–67. [= (2002) 148–60]
- (1983) 'Sophokles in seinen Fragmenten', in de Romilly (1983) 185–222. [= (2002) 263–92 = Hofmann (1991) 79–109]
- (1985) 'Aristophanica' in Acerts *et al.* (1985) 103–18. [= (2002) 301–19]
- (2002) *Noch einmal zu . . . Kleine Schriften von Stefan Radt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag* (ed. M. A. Harder *et al.*; Mnem. Suppl. 235; Leiden, Boston, Cologne).
- (2007) 'Platonica altera', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 60: 117–22.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Rattenbury, R. M. (1936) 'Sophocles, *Ajax* 866–78', *PCPS* 160–2: 6–7.
- Rau, P. (1967) *Paratragodia. Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes* (Zetemata 45; Munich).
- Rauchenstein, R. (1873) 'Zu Sophokles Aias', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 107 = *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 19: 581–8.
- Redondo, J. (2003) 'Satyric diction in the extant Sophoclean fragments: a reconsideration', in Sommerstein (2003) 413–31.
- Reeve, M. D. (1973) 'Interpolation in Greek tragedy, III', *GRBS* 14: 145–71.
- Rehm, R. (2002) *The Play of Space. Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton and Oxford).
- Reichard, E. (1880) *De interpolatione fabulae Sophocleae quae inscribitur Ajax* (diss. Jena; Bremen).
- Reinhardt, K. (1947) *Sophokles*³ (Frankfurt am Main). [1st edn 1933]
- (1979) *Sophocles* (transl. H. and D. Harvey; Oxford).
- Reisig, C. K. (1818) review of Hermann¹, *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 15/4: 249–63.
- Reiske, J. J. (1753) *Animadversiones ad Sophoclem* (Leipzig).
- (1753–69) marginalia in a copy of Reiske (1753) sent to David Ruhnkensius in 1769, Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek 755 D 13. [See Finglass (2009b) 204.]
- (pre-1774) *Jo. Jacobi Reiske in Sophoclis Tragoedias Emendationes et Coniecturae*, Bodley MS D'Orville 372.
- Reiter, G. (1962) *Die griechischen Bezeichnungen der Farben Weiss, Grau und Braun. Eine Bedeutungsuntersuchung* (Commentationes Aenipontanae 16; Innsbruck).
- Reitzenstein, R. (1890–1) 'Inedita poetarum Graecorum fragmenta', *Index lectionum in Academia Rostochiensis semestri hiberno a. MDCCCXC/XCI ab die XV M. Octobris publice privatimque habendarum*.
- Renehan, R. F. (1976) *Studies in Greek Texts. Critical Observations to Homer, Plato, Euripides, Aristophanes and Other Authors* (Hypommemata 43; Göttingen).
- (1984) 'Ποικιλότροπος in Sappho: the first word of poem 1', in Boegehold *et al.* (1984) 255–8.
- (1985) review article on Bond's commentary on Euripides' *Heracles*, *CP* 80: 143–75.
- (1987) review article on the editions of Callimachus *Hymns* 5 and 6 by A. W. Bulloch and N. Hopkinson, *CP* 82: 240–54.
- (1992) review article on Ll-J/W, Sophocles OCT, *CP* 87: 335–75.
- (2001) 'Some supplements to the revised *LSJ* supplement', *Glotta* 77: 221–43.
- Revermann, M. (2006) *Comic Business. Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy* (Oxford).
- Revermann, M., and Wilson, P. (2008) (eds.) *Performance, Iconography, Reception. Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Rhodes, P. J. (2003) 'Nothing to do with democracy: Athenian drama and the polis', *JHS* 123: 104–19.
- Rhodes, P. J., and Osborne, R. (2003) *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 BC* (Oxford).
- Richardson, B. E. (1933) *Old Age among the Ancient Greeks. The Greek Portrayal of Old Age in Literature, Art, and Inscriptions, with a Study of the Duration of Life among the Ancient Greeks on the Basis of Inscriptional Evidence* (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology 16; Baltimore).
- Rijksbaron, A. (1991) *Grammatical Observations on Euripides' Bacchae* (Amsterdam Studies in Greek Philology 1; Amsterdam).
- (1997) (ed.) *New Approaches to Greek Particles. Proceedings of the Colloquium held in Amsterdam, January 4–6, 1996, to honour C. J. Ruijgh on the Occasion of his Retirement* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 7; Amsterdam).
- Risch, E. (1949) 'Griechische Determinativkomposita', *IF* 59: 1–61. [= (1981) 1–61]
- (1962) 'Das indogermanische Wort für "hundert"', *IF* 67: 129–41. [= (1981) 677–89]
- (1974) *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*² (Berlin and New York). [1st edn Berlin and Leipzig 1937]
- (1976) 'Entlehnt oder unverwand? Zum Problem der griechisch-lateinischen Beziehungen', in André *et al.* (1976) II 883–97. [= (1981) 576–90]
- (1981) *Kleine Schriften* (ed. A. Etter and M. Looser; Berlin and New York).
- Ritenour, A. E., Morton, M. J., McManus, J. G., Barillo, D. J., and Cancio, L. C. (2008) 'Lightning injury: a review', *Burns. Journal of the International Society for Burn Injuries* 34: 585–94.
- Ritschl, F. W. (1829) *Schedae criticae* (Halle).
- Ritter, F. (1861) 'Sieben unechte schlussstellen in den tragödien des Sophokles', *Philologus* 17: 422–36.
- Roberts, D. H. (1987) 'Parting words: final lines in Sophocles and Euripides', *CQ* N.S. 37: 51–64.
- Robertson, D. S. (1944) 'Four notes on Aeschylus', *CR* 58: 34–5.
- Robertson, N. (1969) 'How to behave at a sacrifice: Hesiod *Erga* 755–56', *CP* 64: 164–9.
- (1996) 'The ancient Mother of the Gods. A missing chapter in the history of Greek religion', in Lane (1996) 239–304.
- Rocconi, E. (2001) 'Il "canto" magico nel mondo greco. Sulle origini magiche del potere psicagogico della musica', *SemRom* 4: 279–87.
- Rocha Pereira, M. H. M. da (1961) *Sobre a autenticidade do fragmento 44 Diehl de Anacreonte* (Coimbra).
- Rohde-Liegle, M., Cahn, H. A., and Ackermann, H. C. (1967) (eds.) *Gestalt und Geschichte. Festschrift Karl Schefold zu seinem sechzigsten Geburtstag am 26. Januar 1965* (Antike Kunst Beiheft 4; Bern).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Roller, L. E. (1996) 'Reflections of the Mother of the Gods in Attic tragedy', in Lane (1996) 305–21.
 (1999) *In Search of God the Mother. The Cult of Anatolian Cybele* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- Romeis, F. S. (1863) *De Ajacis Sophoclei compositione* (Progr. Neuburg an der Donau).
- Romilly, J. de (1983) (ed.) *Sophocle* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 29; Vandoeuvres).
- Roos, J. de (1976) 'A new root *TER– "speak clearly"? Some comments on Greek τῶρός and Hittite tar–', in Bremer *et al.* (1976) 323–31.
- Rosenbloom, D. (2001) 'Ajax is *megas*. Is that all we can say?', *Prudentia* 33: 109–29.
- Rosivach, V. J. (1975) 'Ajax' intended victims', *CW* 69: 201–2.
 (1987) 'Execution by stoning in Athens', *CA* 6: 232–48.
- Rüedi, E. H. (1969) *Vom Έλλανοδικας zum έλλανοτοπόλης. Eine Studie zu den verbalen Rektionskomposita auf –ας / –ης* (Zurich).
- Ruge, W. (1942) 'Olympos (16)', *RE* 18/1: 314.
- Ruhnkenius, D. (1749) *Epistola Critica I in Homeridarum Hymnos et Hesiodum, ad virum clarissimum, Ludov. Casp. Valckenarium* (Leiden).
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1971) *Autour de 'τε έπique'. Études sur la syntaxe grecque* (Amsterdam).
 (1976) 'Observations sur l'emploi onomastique de κεκληθθαι, vis-à-vis de celui de καλεϊσθαι, notamment dans la tragédie attique', in Bremer *et al.* (1976) 333–95. [= (1991–6) 1701–63]
 (1991–6) *Scripta minora ad linguam graecam pertinentia*, 2 vols. (ed. A. Rijksbaron and F. M. J. Waanders; Amsterdam).
- Rutherford, R. B. (1982) 'Tragic form and feeling in the *Iliad*', *JHS* 102: 145–60.
 [= Cairns (2001) 260–93, with addendum]
- Rutter, N. K., and Sparkes, B. A. (2000) (eds.) *Word and Image in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 1; Edinburgh).
- Rzach, A. (1874) *Über antistrophische Wort- und Gedankenresponson in den Chorliedern der sophokleischen Dramen* (Progr. Prague).
- Sakellariou, M. B. (1958) *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Collection de l'Institut Français d'Athènes 17; Athens).
- Sansone, D. (1975) *Aeschylean Metaphors for Intellectual Activity* (Hermes Einzelschriften 35; Wiesbaden).
- Saxl, F. (1936) 'Veritas filia temporis', in Klibansky and Paton (1936) 197–222.
- Scaliger, J. J. (1568–1609) marginalia in his copy of Stephanus's edition (Geneva 1568) in the Leiden University Library; shelfmark 756 D 25. [See Finglass (2009b) 189–91.]
- Schachter, A. (1981–94) *Cults of Boiotia*, 4 vols. (BICS Suppl. 38; London).
- Schadewaldt, W. (1936) 'Aischylos' Achilleis', *Hermes* 71: 25–69. [= (1970) 1308–54]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1956) 'Zum zweiten Stasimon des "Koenig Oedipus"', *SIFC* 27–8: 489–97.
[= (1970) 1 476–83]
- (1970) *Hellas und Hesperien*², 2 vols. (Zurich and Stuttgart). [1st edn 1960]
- Schaefer, G. H. (1802) (ed.) *Thesaurus Criticus Novus sive Syntagma Scriptionum Philologicarum rariorum aevi recentioris. Tomus Primus* (Leipzig).
- (1808) *Lamberti Bos Ellipses Graecae* (Leipzig and London).
- Schäublin, C. (1985) (ed.) *Catalepton. Festschrift für Bernhard Wyss zum 80. Geburtstag* (Basel).
- Schefold, K. (1976) 'Sophokles' Aias auf einer Lekythos', *AK* 19: 71–8.
- Schein, S. L. (1979) *The Iambic Trimeter in Aeschylus and Sophocles. A Study in Metrical Form* (Colombia Studies in the Classical Tradition 6; Leiden).
- (1997) 'Divinity and moral agency in Sophoclean tragedy', in Lloyd (1997) 123–38.
- Scheltema, H. J. (1948) *Beschrijving van het Leidische Sophocles palimpsest* (Leiden University Library, BPG 60A II).
- (1949) 'De codice Sophocleo Lugdunensi', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 2: 132–7.
- Schmidt, (Friedrich) W(ilhelm) (1862) *De Ubertate Orationis Sophocleae. Pars altera* (Progr. Neustrelitz).
- (1864) *Analecta Sophoclea et Euripidea* (Neustrelitz).
- (1886–7) *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern nebst einem Anhang zur Kritik der Anthologie*, 3 vols. (Berlin).
- Schmidt, V. (1975) 'Zu Euripides, *Kyklops* 120 und 707', *Maia* n.s. 27: 291–3.
- Schneider, M. (1905) 'Sophokles' Aias v. 144 ἱππομανῆ λειμῶνα und die übrigen mit -μανης gebildeten Adjektiva', in Ehwald *et al.* (1905) 109–30.
- Schneidewin, F. W. (1848a) 'Sophokles Aias v. 296', *Philologus* 3: 609.
- (1848b) 'Sophokles Aias 940', *Philologus* 3: 658.
- (1849) 'Sophokleische studien', *Philologus* 4: 450–77.
- Schnyder, B. (1995) *Angst in Szene gesetzt. Zur Darstellung der Emotionen auf der Bühne des Aischylos* (Classica Monacensia 10; Tübingen).
- Schöll, A. (1839) *Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Poesie. Erster Theil. Zur Kenntniß der tragischen Poesie der Griechen. Erster Band. Die Tetralogien der attischen Tragiker* (Berlin).
- Schreckenberg, H. (1964) *ANANKÉ. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Wortgebrauchs* (Zetemata 36; Munich).
- Schulze, W. (1924) 'Zur Bildung des Vokativs im Griechischen und im Lateinischen', in Konow *et al.* (1924) 240–54. [= (1934) 82–96]
- (1934) *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen).
- Schuursma, J. A. (1932) *De poetica vocabulorum abusione apud Aeschylum* (diss. Amsterdam).
- Schwartz, A. (2009) *Reinstating the Hoplite. Arms, Armour and Phalanx Fighting in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Historia Einzelschriften 207; Stuttgart).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Schwinge, E.-R. (1962) *Die Stellung der Trachinierinnen im Werk des Sophokles* (Hypomnemata 1; Göttingen).
- Scodel, R. (1993) (ed.) *Theater and Society in the Classical World* (Ann Arbor).
- (1998) 'The captive's dilemma: sexual acquiescence in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades*', *HSCP* 98: 137–54.
- (2003) 'The politics of Sophocles' *Ajax*', *SCI* 32: 31–42.
- (2006) 'Aetiology, autochthony, and Athenian identity in *Ajax* and *Oedipus Coloneus*', in Davidson *et al.* (2006) 65–78.
- Scullion, J. S. (1990) *The Athenian Stage and Scene-setting in Early Tragedy* (diss. Harvard). [n.v.]
- (1994) *Three Studies in Athenian Dramaturgy* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 25; Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- (2001) review of Garvie's edition, *CJ* 96: 219–23.
- (2002) 'Tragic dates', *CQ* n.s. 52: 81–101.
- (2003) 'Euripides and Macedon, or the silence of the *Frogs*', *CQ* n.s. 53: 389–400.
- Seaford, R. A. S. (1989) 'Homeric and tragic sacrifice', *TAPA* 119: 87–95.
- Seager, J. (1813) 'Miscellaneous observations on several ancient and modern authors, no. 11', *The Classical Journal* vol. 7 no. 14: 240–7.
- Segal, C. P. (1995) *Sophocles' Tragic World. Divinity, Nature, Society* (Cambridge, MA and London).
- (1996) 'Catharsis, audience, and closure in Greek tragedy', in Silk (1996) 149–72.
- Seidler, J. F. A. (1809) 'Epistola critica Seidleri', in Lobeck's first edition, pp. 433–40. [Not reprinted in Lobeck's second and third editions]
- Serghidou, A. (2001) 'Athena *Salpinx* and the ethics of music', in Deacy and Villing (2001) 57–74.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. S. (1956) *Propertiana* (Cambridge).
- Shapiro, H. A. (1998) 'Autochthony and the visual arts in fifth-century Athens', in Boedeker and Raafaub (1998) 127–51.
- Shilleto, R. (1859) 'Aristophanes', *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* vol. 4 no. 12: 308–17.
- Sicherl, M. (1970) 'Die Tragik des Aias', *Hermes* 98: 14–37.
- (1977) 'The tragic issue in Sophocles' *Ajax*', *YCS* 25: 67–98.
- Sideras, A. (1971) *Aeschylus Homericus. Untersuchungen zu den Homerismen der aischyleischen Sprache* (Hypomnemata 31; Göttingen).
- Sienkewicz, T. J. (1976) 'Sophocles' *Telepheia*', *ZPE* 20: 109–12.
- Silk, M. S. (1996) (ed.) *Tragedy and the Tragic. Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford).
- Simon, E. (2003) *Aias von Salamis als mythische Persönlichkeit* (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe–Universität, Frankfurt am Main, Band 41 Nr. 1; Stuttgart).
- Simpson, M. (1969) 'Pindar's *Ninth Olympian*', *GRBS* 10: 113–24.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Sjölund, R. (1938) *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen* (Uppsala).
- Skoda, F. (1983) 'La syrinx dans le vocabulaire de l'anatomie en grec ancien', in Alden *et al.* (1983) 381–91.
- Slater, W. J. (1991) (ed.) *Dining in a Classical Context* (Ann Arbor).
- Smith, C. H. (1896) *Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum*, vol. III. *Vases of the Finest Period* (London).
- Smith, O. L. (1971–80) 'A note on the Sophocles MS *Vat. Gr. 1333*', *C&M* 32: 35–43.
- (1975) *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus. I: The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius* (Mnem. Suppl. 37; Leiden).
- Snodgrass, A. M. (1964a) *Early Greek Armour and Weapons from the End of the Bronze Age to 600 BC* (Edinburgh).
- (1964b) 'Carian armourers – the growth of a tradition', *JHS* 84: 107–18.
- (1967) *Arms and Armour of the Greeks* (London and Southampton).
- Solmsen, F. (1984) 'φρήν, καρδία, ψυχή in Greek tragedy', in Gerber (1984) 265–74.
- Sommer, F. (1948) *Žur Geschichte der griechischen Nominalkomposita* (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften philosophisch-historische Klasse n.F. 27; Munich).
- Sommerstein, A. H. (1995/6) 'Aeschylus' epitaph', *Museum Criticum* 30/1: 111–17. [= (2010a) 195–201, with addendum]
- (1999) 'The anatomy of euphemism in Aristophanic comedy', in De Martino and Sommerstein (1999) 183–217. [= (2009) 70–103]
- (2002a) 'The titles of Greek dramas', *SemRom* 5: 1–16. [= (2010a) 11–29, with addenda]
- (2002b) 'Comic elements in tragic language: the case of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', in Willi (2002) 151–68.
- (2003) (ed.) *Shards from Kolonos. Studies in Sophoclean Fragments* (Le Rane: Collana di Studi e Testi 34; Bari).
- (2004) 'Violence in Greek drama', *Ordia Prima* 3: 41–56. [= (2010a) 30–46]
- (2008) review of N. G. Wilson (ed.) *Aristophanis Fabulae* (Oxford 2007) and *Aristophanea* (Oxford 2007), *Exemplaria Classica* 12: 283–300.
- (2009) *Talking about Laughter and Other Studies in Greek Comedy* (Oxford).
- (2010a) *The Tangled Ways of Zeus and Other Studies in and around Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
- (2010b) *Aeschylean Tragedy*² (London). [1st edn Bari 1996].
- (2011), 'Fragments and lost tragedies', in Markantonatos (2011).
- (forthcoming) 'Atē in Aeschylus', in Lurje (forthcoming) (ed).
- Sommerstein, A. H., and Fletcher, J. (2007) (eds.) *Horkos. The Oath in Greek Society* (Exeter).
- Sparkes, B. A. (1985) 'Aspects of Onesimos', in Boulter (1985) 18–39.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Spivey, N. (1994) 'Psephological heroes', in Osborne and Hornblower (1994) 39–51.
- Staden, H. von (2007) "'The Oath", the oaths, and the Hippocratic corpus', in Boudon-Millot *et al.* (2007) 425–66.
- Stefec, R. (2009) 'Kollation der Handschrift Zu (Turyn). Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der paläologischen Vulgata des Sophokles', *WS* 122: 21–36.
- Steiner, A. (2007) *Reading Greek Vases* (Cambridge).
- Steiner, D. T. (2001) *Images in Mind. Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought* (Princeton and Oxford).
- Steinhauer, G. (2001) 'The classical mesogaia (5th–4th century BC)', in Aikaterinidis (2001) 80–139.
- Stephan, G. (1981) *Die Ausdruckskraft der caesura media im iambischen Trimeter der attischen Tragödie* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 126; Königstein).
- Stephanopoulos, T. K. (1988) 'Tragica II', *ΣPE* 75: 3–38.
- Stephanus, H. (1568) *Annotationes in Sophoclem et Euripidem* (Paris).
(1831–65) *Thesaurus Graecae linguae*, 8 vols. (revision of 1572 original by C. B. Hase, K. W. Dindorf, and L. Dindorf; Paris).
- Sternberg, R. H. (2005) (ed.) *Pity and Power in Ancient Athens* (Cambridge and New York).
- Stevens, P. T. (1976) *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides* (Hermes Einzelschriften 38; Wiesbaden).
(1986) 'Ajax in the *Trugrede*', *CQ* n.s. 36: 327–36.
- Stinton, T. C. W. (1965) *Euripides and the Judgement of Paris* (JHS Suppl. 11; London). [= (1990) 17–75]
(1967) review of Dawe (1964), *Gnomon* 39: 535–41. [= (1990) 76–83]
(1975a) 'More rare verse-forms', *BICS* 22: 84–108. [= (1990) 113–42]
(1975b) 'Agamemnon 1127 and the limits of hyperbaton', *PCPS* n.s. 21: 82–93. [= (1990) 98–112]
(1976) 'Notes on Greek tragedy, I', *JHS* 96: 121–45. [= (1990) 197–235]
(1977a) 'Notes on Greek tragedy, II', *JHS* 97: 127–53. [= (1990) 271–309]
(1977b) 'Pause and period in the lyrics of Greek tragedy', *CQ* n.s. 27: 27–66. [= (1990) 310–61]
(1977c) 'Interlinear hiatus in trimeters', *CQ* n.s. 27: 67–72. [= (1990) 362–8]
(1990) *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Strauss, B. S. (1993) *Fathers and Sons in Athens. Ideology and Society in the Era of the Peloponnesian War* (Princeton).
- Stray, C. (2004) 'From one Museum to another: the *Museum Criticum* (1813–26) and the *Philological Museum* (1831–33)', *Victorian Periodicals Review* 37: 289–314.
- Sullivan, S. D. (1997) *Aeschylus' Use of Psychological Terminology. Traditional and New* (Montreal and Buffalo).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Sulzberger, M. (1926) 'Ὅνομα ἐπώνυμον. Les noms propres chez Homère et dans la mythologie grecque', *REG* 39: 381–447.
- Süss, W. (1910) *Ethos. Studien zur älteren griechischen Rhetorik* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Suter, A. (2008a) 'Male lament in Greek tragedy', in (2008b) 156–80.
- (2008b) (ed.) *Lament. Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond* (Oxford and New York).
- Svennung, J. (1958) *Anredeformen. Vergleichende Forschungen zur indirekten Anrede in der dritten Person und zum Nominativ für den Vokativ* (Acta Societatis Litterarum Humaniorum Regiae Upsaliensis 42; Uppsala and Wiesbaden).
- Svensson, A. (1937) *Der Gebrauch des Bestimmten Artikels in der Nachklassischen Griechischen Epik* (Lund).
- Taddei, A. (2003) 'Le colpevoli mani di Aiace', in Battezzato (2003) 129–48.
- Taplin, O. P. (1971) 'Significant actions in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', *GRBS* 12: 25–44.
- (1977) *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
- (1978) *Greek Tragedy in Action* (London).
- (1996) 'Comedy and the tragic', in Silk (1996) 188–202.
- Taylor, M. C. (1997) *Salamis and the Salaminioi. The History of an Unofficial Athenian Demos* (ΑΡΧΑΙΑ ΕΛΛΑΣ Monographs on Ancient Greek History and Archaeology 5; Amsterdam).
- Telò, M. (2002a) 'Per una grammatica dei gesti nella tragedia greca (I): cadere a terra, alzarsi; coprirsi, scoprirsi il volto', *MD* 48: 9–75.
- (2002b) 'Per una grammatica dei gesti nella tragedia greca (II): la supplica', *MD* 49: 9–51.
- Thesleff, H. (1954) *Studies on Intensification in Early and Classical Greek* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 21.1; Helsingfors).
- Thielemann, K. H. (1849) *Adnotationes in aliquot Sophoclis locos* (Merseburg).
- Thiersch, F. (1826) *Griechische Grammatik vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*³ (Leipzig). [1st edn 1812]
- Thompson, D. W. (1936) *A Glossary of Greek Birds*² (St Andrews University Publications 39; London). [1st edn Oxford 1895]
- Thompson, E. M., and Jebb, R. C. (1885) *Facsimile of the Laurentian Manuscript of Sophocles* (London).
- Thomson, G. D. (1939) 'The postponement of interrogatives in Attic drama', *CQ* 33: 147–52.
- Todd, S. C. (1993) *The Shape of Athenian Law* (Oxford).
- Toohy, P. (2004) *Melancholy, Love, and Time. Boundaries of the Self in Ancient Literature* (Ann Arbor).
- Tosi, R. (1991) *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche. 10.000 citazioni dall'antichità al rinascimento nell'originale e in traduzione con commento storico letterario e filologico* (Milan).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Touchefeu, O. (1981) 'Aias I', *LIMC* 1/1: 312–36.
- Toup, J. (1760–6) *Emendationes in Suidam: in quibus plurima loca veterum Graecorum, Sophoclis et Aristophanis in primis, cum explicantur tum emaculantur*, 3 vols. (London 1760, 1764, 1766).
- Tournier, E. (1882) 'Sophocle', *RPh* 6: 113–48. [under the pseudonym 'Y']
- Turkeltaub, D. (2007) 'Perceiving Iliadic gods', *HSCP* 103: 51–81.
- Turyn, A. (1943) *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York).
 (1944) 'The manuscripts of Sophocles', *Traditio* 2: 1–41.
 (1949) 'The Sophocles recension of Manuel Moschopoulos', *TAPA* 80: 94–173.
 (1952) *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 36.1–2; Urbana).
 (1960) 'Miscellanea', in Alfonsi *et al.* (1960) II 1013–23.
 (1964) *Codices Graeci Vaticani saeculis XIII et XIV scripti annorumque notis instructi* (Codices e Vaticanis Selecti 28; Vatican City).
- Tyrwhitt, T. (pre-1786) marginalia in his copy of Stephanus's edition (Geneva 1568) in the British Library, shelfmark 653.c.13.
- Tziatzi-Papagianni, M. (1994) *Die Sprüche der sieben Weisen. Zwei byzantinische Sammlungen* (Beiträge zum Altertumskunde 51; Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- Usener, H. (1865) 'An den Herausgeber', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 91 = *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 11: 225–68. [= (1912–14) II 65–126]
 (1912–14) *Kleine Schriften*, 4 vols. (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Valckenaer, L. C. (1743–6) *Observationes in Sophoclem* (Leiden University Library, BPL 384). [See Finglass (2009b) 196–8.]
 (pre-1775) annotations in a copy of the edition of Sophocles published in Cambridge in 1669, Leiden University Library, shelfmark 755 D 12. [See Finglass (2009b) 198–9.]
- Valk, M. H. A. L. H. van der. (1949) *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey* (Leiden).
 (1956) 'Sur le texte de Sophocle', *REG* 69: 449–51.
 (1963–4) *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, 2 vols. (Leiden).
- Vasquez, P. R. (1972) *Literary Convention in Scenes of Madness and Suffering in Greek Tragedy* (diss. Columbia). [known to me from Papadopoulou (2005)]
- Vassileva, M. (2001) 'Further considerations on the cult of Kybele', *Anatolian Studies* 51: 51–63.
- Verdenius, W. J. (1956) review of Denniston, *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 9: 248–52.
 (1985) 'Notes on the Parodos of Aeschylus' *Suppliants*', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 38: 281–306.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1982) 'La belle mort et le cadavre outragé', in Gnioli and Vernant (1982) 45–76. [= (1989) 41–79 ≈ (1991) 50–74]
 (1989) *L'individu, la mort, l'amour. Soi-même et l'autre en Grèce ancienne* (no place).
 (1991) *Mortals and Immortals. Collected Essays* (ed. F. I. Zeitlin; Princeton).
- Visser, E. (1997) *Homers Katalog der Schiffe* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Wachter, R. (1998) 'Griechisch χαῖρε: Vorgeschichte eines Grusswortes', *MH* 55: 65–75.
- Wackernagel, J. (1887) 'Miscellen zur griechischen grammatik', *KZ* 28: 109–45. [= (1953–79) I 591–627]
- (1889) *Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Komposita* (Progr. Basel). [= (1953–79) II 897–961]
- (1892a) review of L. Sütterlin, *Zur Geschichte der Verba denominativa im Alt-Griechischen. I. Teil. Die Verba Denominativa auf -άω, -έω, -όω* (Strassburg 1891), *BPW* 12: 1110–13. [= (1953–79) III 1602–6]
- (1892b) 'Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung', *IF* 1: 333–436. [= (1953–79) I 1–104]
- (1893) *Beiträge zur Lehre vom griechischen Akzent* (Progr. Basel). [= (1953–79) II 1072–1107]
- (1895) 'Miszellen zur griechischen grammatik', *KZ* 33: 1–62. [= (1953–79) I 680–741]
- (1912) *Über einige antike Anredeformen* (Progr. Göttingen). [= (1953–79) II 970–99]
- (1914) 'Akzentstudien II', *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 20–51. [= (1953–79) II 1122–53]
- (1916a) 'Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer', *Glotta* 7: 161–319. [= (1916b) 1–159]
- (1916b) *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Forschungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik 4; Göttingen).
- (1925a) 'Griechische Miszellen', *Glotta* 14: 36–67. [= (1953–79) II 844–75]
- (1925b) review of J. P. Postgate, *A Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (London 1924), *IF* 43: 48–59. [= (1953–79) II 1188–98]
- (1926–8) *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, 2 vols. (Basel).
- (1953–79) *Kleine Schriften*, 3 vols. (Göttingen).
- (2009) *Lectures on Syntax with Special Reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic* (transl. D. R. Langslow; Oxford).
- Wærn, I. (1951) *ΓΗΣ ΟΣΤΕΑ. The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry* (diss. Uppsala).
- (1985) 'Der weinende Held', *Eranos* 83: 223–9.
- Wakefield, G. (1789–95) *Silva Critica: sive in auctores sacros profanosque commentarius philologus*, 5 vols. (Cambridge 1789, Cambridge 1790, Cambridge 1792, London 1793, London 1795).
- Wakker, G. (1994) *Conditions and Conditionals. An Investigation of Ancient Greek* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 3; Amsterdam).
- (1997) 'Emphasis and affirmation. Some aspects of μήν in tragedy', in *Rijksbaron* (1997) 209–31.

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- Wallace, R. W. (2007) 'Law's enemies in ancient Athens', in Cantarella (2007) 183–96.
- Watkins, C. (1967) 'An Indo-European construction in Greek and Latin', *HSCP* 71: 115–19.
- (1970) 'Language of gods and language of men: remarks on some Indo-European metalinguistic traditions', in Puhvel (1970) 1–17. [= (1994) II 456–72]
- (1994) *Selected Writings*, 2 vols. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 80; ed. L. Oliver; Innsbruck).
- Webster, T. B. L. (1970) *Greek Theatre Production*² (London). [1st edn 1956]
- Wecklein, N. (1867) review of Seyffert's edition, *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 95 = *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 13: 451–9.
- (1869) *Ars Sophoclis Emendandi. Accedunt Analecta Euripidea* (Würzburg).
- (1881) 'Zu griechischen Schriftstellern', *RhM* n.F. 36: 135–45.
- (1911) *Über Missverständnisse älterer Wendungen und Ausdrücke bei den griechischen Dichtern, insbesondere bei den Tragikern* (Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse Jahrgang 1911, 3. Abhandlung; Munich).
- Wees, H. van (1994) 'The Homeric way of war: the *Iliad* and the hoplite phalanx (II)', *G&R* 2nd ser. 41: 131–55.
- (2004) *Greek Warfare. Myths and Realities* (London).
- Weiler, I. (1988) 'Witwen und Waisen im griechischen Altertum. Bemerkungen zu antiken Randgruppen', in Kloft (1988) 15–33.
- Weilhartner, J. (2005) *Mykenische Opfergaben nach Aussage der Linear B-Texte* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften philosophisch-historische Klasse Denkschriften 330; Veröffentlichungen der Mykenischen Kommission 22; Vienna).
- Weiss, C. (1984) *Griechische Flussgottheiten in vorhellenistischer Zeit. Ikonographie und Bedeutung* (Beiträge zur Archäologie 17; Würzburg).
- Welcker, F. G. (1824) *Die Aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos nebst Winken über die Trilogie des Aeschylus überhaupt* (Darmstadt).
- (1829) 'Ueber den Aias des Sophokles', *RhM* 3: 43–92, 229–64. [= (1845) 264–340, with Addendum, 340–55]
- (1839–41) *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet*, 3 vols. (RhM Suppl. 2.1–3; Bonn).
- (1845) *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2 (Bonn).
- Wesseling, P. (1727) *Observationum variarum libri duo* (Amsterdam).
- (1751) *Viri clarissimi et doctissimi Petri Wesselingii eloquentia & historiarum ut et Graecae linguae in alma academica civitatis Trajectinae ordinarii professoris in Sophoclis Ajacem dictata* (National Art Library, Dyce MS 59 25.F.55). [See Finglass (2009b) 192–3.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- West, M. L. (1971) *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford).
 (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14; Berlin and New York).
 (1977) review of Dawe, *STS* vols. I–II, *CP* 72: 264–7.
 (1978a) ‘Tragica II’, *BICS* 25: 106–22.
 (1978b) review of Dawe’s first edition, *Gnomon* 50: 236–43.
 (1979a) ‘The Prometheus trilogy’, *JHS* 99: 130–48. [= M. Lloyd (2007) 359–96, with Postscript]
 (1979b) ‘Tragica III’, *BICS* 26: 104–17.
 (1982) *Greek Metre* (Oxford).
 (1983) *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford).
 (1984) ‘Tragica VII’, *BICS* 31: 171–96.
 (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford).
 (1990) *Studies in Aeschylus* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 1; Stuttgart).
 (1991) review of Ll-J/W, Sophocles OCT, *CR* n.s. 41: 299–301.
 (1992) *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).
 (1997) *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
 (1999a) ‘Frühe Interpolationen in der Ilias’, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch–Historische Klasse* Nr. 4: 181–91.
 (1999b) ‘Ancestral curses’, in Griffin (1999a) 31–45.
 (2001a) *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig).
 (2001b) ‘Some Homeric words’, *Glotta* 77: 118–35.
 (2007) *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
 Wieseler, F. (1861) ‘Zu Sophokles’, *Philologus* 17: 561–2.
 Wifstrand, A. (1946) ‘Eine Art Transitivierung von Denominativa auf –έω’, *Eranos* 44: 244–8.
 Wigodsky, M. M. (1962) ‘The “salvation” of Ajax’, *Hermes* 90: 149–58.
 Wijnperse, W. M. A. van de (1929) *De Terminologie van het Jachtwezen bij Sophocles* (Amsterdam).
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, E. F. W. U. von (1879) ‘Parerga’, *Hermes* 14: 161–86.
 [= (1935–72) IV 1–23]
 (1883) ‘Die beiden Elektren’, *Hermes* 18: 214–63. [= (1935–72) VI 161–208]
 (1886) ‘Die Bühne des Aischylos’, *Hermes* 21: 597–622. [= (1935–72) I 148–72]
 (1921) *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin).
 (1924a) *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, 2 vols. (Berlin).
 (1924b) ‘Lese Früchte’, *Hermes* 59: 249–73. [= (1935–72) IV 343–67]
 (1931–2) *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 vols. (ed. G. Klaffenbach; Berlin).
 (1935–72) *Kleine Schriften*, 6 vols. (Berlin and Amsterdam).
 Wiles, D. (1997) *Tragedy in Athens. Performance Space and Theatrical Meaning* (Cambridge).

7. WORKS CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME WITH DATE

- (2007) *Mask and Performance in Greek Tragedy. From Ancient Festival to Modern Experimentation* (Cambridge).
- Wilkinson, K. W. (2009) 'Palladas and the age of Constantine', *JRS* 99: 36–60.
- Willi, A. (2002) (ed.) *The Language of Greek Comedy* (Oxford).
- (2003) *The Languages of Aristophanes. Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek* (Oxford).
- (2008) *Sikelismos. Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft im griechischen Sizilien* (8.–5. Jh. v. Chr.) (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana 29; Basel).
- Williams, B. A. O. (1993) *Shame and Necessity* (Sather Classical Lectures 57; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- Williams, D. (1980) 'Ajax, Odysseus and the arms of Achilles', *AK* 23: 137–45.
- Willink, C. W. (1998) 'Euripides, *Hippolytus* 145–50', *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 51: 715–18. [= (2010) 268–71]
- (1999) 'Further critical notes on Euripides' *Hippolytus*', *CQ* n.s. 49: 408–27. [= (2010) 272–300]
- (2001) 'Critical studies in the *cantica* of Sophocles: I. *Antigone*', *CQ* n.s. 51: 65–89. [= (2010) 347–81]
- (2002) 'Critical studies in the *cantica* of Sophocles: II. *Ajax*, *Trachiniae*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*', *CQ* n.s. 52: 50–80. [= (2010) 382–423]
- (2010) *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (ed. W. B. Henry; Leiden).
- Willmott, J. (2000) *The Application of Linguistic Data to Textual Problems (With Particular Reference to the Mood in Indirect Speech in Sophocles)* (MPhil diss. Cambridge).
- Wills, J. (1996) *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion* (Oxford).
- Wilson, J. R. (1971) 'τόλμα and the meaning of τάλας', *AJP* 92: 292–300.
- Wilson, N. G. (1976) review of Dawe, *STS* vols. I–II, *JHS* 96: 171–6.
- (1977) 'A note on two manuscripts of Sophocles', *JHS* 97: 168–9.
- (1980) review of Dawe, *STS* vol. III, *JHS* 100: 218–19.
- (1983a) *Scholars of Byzantium* (London).
- (1983b) 'A mysterious Byzantine scriptorium: Ioannikios and his colleagues', *Scrittura e Civiltà* 7: 161–76.
- (2007) *Aristophanea. Studies on the Text of Aristophanes* (Oxford).
- Wilson, P. (1999) 'The *aulos* in Athens', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) 58–95.
- Winkler, J. J., and Zeitlin, F. I. (1990) (eds.) *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton).
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. (1979) 'Sophoclea', *BICS* 26: 1–12.
- (1980) *Sophocles. An Interpretation* (Cambridge).
- (1983a) *Studies in Aeschylus* (Cambridge).
- (1983b) 'Sophocles and women', in de Romilly (1983) 233–49.
- Wolf, E. (1910) *Sentenz und Reflexion bei Sophokles. Ein Beitrag zu seiner poetischen Technik* (diss. Tübingen).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Wolf, F. A., and Buttmann, P. (1808) (eds.) *Museum Antiquitatis Studiorum. Vol. I. Fasc. I.* (Berlin).
- Wolf, J. C. (1722–4) *Anecdota Graeca, sacra et profana, ex codicibus manu exaratis nunc primum in lucem edita, versione Latina donata, et notis illustrata*, 4 vols. (Hamburg).
- Wolff, G. A. (1843) *De Sophoclis scholiorum Laurentianorum variis lectionibus* (Leipzig).
 (1852) review of Schneidewin's editions of *Ajax* (1849), *Philoctetes* (1849), and *Oedipus Rex* (1851), *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* ('Zimmermann's Zeitschrift') 10: 518–40.
- Worman, N. (2008) *Abusive Mouths in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
- Worthington, I., and Foley, J. M. (2002) (eds.) *Epea and Grammata. Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greek* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece 4; Mnem. Suppl. 230; Leiden, Boston, Cologne).
- Wright, J. H. (1894) 'Critical notes on Sophocles', *TAPA* 25: xxxii–xxxiv.
- Wright, M. E. (2005) *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies. A Study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians* (Oxford).
 (2006) 'Cyclops and the Euripidean tetralogy', *PCPS* n.s. 52: 23–48.
- Wunder, E. (1823) *Adversaria in Sophoclis Philoctetam* (Leipzig).
 (1837) *Ueber Christ. Aug. Lobeck's neue Ausgabe des Sophokleischen Aias* (Leipzig).
 (1841) *Emendationes in Sophoclis Trachinias* (Grimma).
- Yatromanolakis, D., and Roilos, P. (2004) (eds.) *Greek Ritual Poetics* (Hellenic Studies 3; Cambridge, MA and London).
- Young, D. C. (1966) 'Sophocles *Ajax* 516', *CP* 61: 249–50.
- Zagagi, N. (1999) 'Comic patterns in Sophocles' *Ichneutae*', in Griffin (1999a) 177–218.
- Zancani Montuoro, P. (1964) 'Heraion alla foce del Sele. I. Altre metope del "Primo Thesaurus"', *Atti e Memorie della Società Magna Grecia* n.s. 5: 57–95.
- Zink, N. (1962) *Griechische Ausdrucksweisen für warm und kalt im seelischen Bereich* (diss. Heidelberg).
- Ziobro, W. J. (1972) 'The entrance and exit of Athena in the *Ajax*', *Classical Folia* 26: 122–8.
- Zunker, A. (1988) *Untersuchungen zur Aiakidensage auf Aigina* (Dissertationen Philosophische Reihe 4; St. Ottilien).
- Zuntz, G. (1955) *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester).
 (1960) 'Theocritus l. 95f.', *CQ* n.s. 10: 37–40. [= (1972) 83–7]
 (1965) *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge).
 (1972) *Opuscula Selecta. Classica, Hellenistica, Christiana* (Manchester).

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Agamemnon
 attacks Teucer: 479–80
 close to Odysseus: 506
 gives way to Odysseus: 503
 implies own conduct not εὐσεβής:
 509
 shares dwelling with brother: 152
- Aeschylus
 Ajax in: 33–4
 changes of scene in: 12–13
- Ajax
 accompanied by Teucer: 26
 accuses enemies of cheating him
 of the Arms: 268
 Aeacid: 32, 327
 aftermath of death, burial: 28, 29,
 40–1
 and Telamon: 266, 272, 361–2
 approves fearlessness: 296, 297
 arrogance: 358, 364
 at edge of camp: 139
 attacks Greeks: 38–9, 148, 150–1,
 203, 212
 birth: 32
 boasts: 257
 carries whip?: 164–5
 commits suicide: 27, 28–30, 31, 32,
 33, 34, 39–40, 136
 compared to animals: 233, 420,
 485
 defends ships: 37, 41
 descended from Zeus: 253
 despises deliberation: 380
 dignified in death: 376
 direct language: 290, 291
 does not change: 319
 dread countenance: 186
 envied: 184
 etymology of name: 265
 exchanges gifts with Hector: 38,
 333–4
 fails to communicate: 222–3
 fears mockery: 246–7
 fierce: 204, 297
 fights Hector: 26, 28, 38, 380
 from Salamis: 177–8
 goes mad: 28, 136
 hated by
 Athena: 37, 135–6
 gods and men: 272
 hates Odysseus: 161
 hedonistic side: 41
 hero cult: 46–51
 imagination: 295, 301, 329
 in
 Aeschylus: 33–4
 art: 28–31
 Homer: 26–7
 other fifth-century treatments:
 36
 Pindar: 31–2
 the Epic Cycle: 27–8
 Underworld: 26
 invokes landscape: 260, 388
 isolated: 29–30, 139, 146, 239, 242,
 254, 264, 375, 376
 kills animals: 28, 31, 38, 144–5,
 258
 ‘last of the heroes’?: 44–6
 laughter of: 228–9
 likened to tower: 185
 loses Arms of Achilles to
 Odysseus: 27–8, 30–1, 32,
 33, 34, 37–8, 145, 150, 320
 mighty warrior: 26, 204
 no regrets: 239
 perverts sacrifice: 207, 212, 333,
 380
 plays board game with Achilles:
 28
 praised by Odysseus: 507
 prefers death to shame: 277
 recovers body of Achilles: 27, 28,
 37

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Ajax (*cont.*)
 rehabilitation: 51–3
 related to Atreidae: 496
 repeat offender: 363
 retains ferocity in death:
 424
 second-best: 261–2
 shield: 143
 sings: 238
 size: 360
 sword: 141, 380
 too old to learn: 312
 uses γνῶμαι: 225
 wisdom: 26, 172
 will not be persuaded: 311
 apocope: 261, 471–2
 Apollo
 and Pan: 344, 347
 Delian: 344, 347
 archers
 bow opposed to shield: 455
 value of: 454
 Ares: 195
 as deliverer: 345, 348
 arrogance, prohibited: 253
 Artemis
 and madness: 191
 receives hunters' offerings:
 192
 Tauropolos: 190–1
 Athena
 addressed as φίλη: 149
 and the Gorgon: 270
 anger of: 358
 blamed by Tecmessa: 412
 connexion with trumpet:
 142
 piercing eyes: 270–1
 relishes Ajax's downfall: 153
 supports Odysseus: 139, 165
 Atreidae
 activities of: 495, 496–8
 associated with Phrygia:
 495
 related to Ajax: 496
 autochthony: 204
 banausic occupations: 454
 barbarians
 and Phrygians: 496
 speech of: 487
 'beginning of evil': 221
 Bias of Priene: 338
 birds: *see* dogs
 black
 blood: 249–50, 523
 θυμός: 412
 horses: 336
 Underworld: 255
 weapons: 211
 blood
 black: 249–50, 523
 warm: 523
 Bosphorus: 397–8
 burial etc. in epic: 307
 Calchas
 friendly to Ajax: 359
 sees future: 357
 son of Thestor: 372
 chorus
 address absent character on
 entrance: 177
 complain about war: 316
 composition: 175
 concerned for themselves: 398,
 401
 condemn Teucer: 452
 depart mid-way though: 372,
 373
 divide: 372
 enter to gain information: 176
 initiate contact with newcomer:
 419
 look to Odysseus for help: 503–4
 loyal to Ajax: 176
 re-entry of: 389–90
 rejoice in Ajax's success: 179
 consolation
 'what's done cannot be undone':
 250
 Crete: 498
 crown of glory: 273

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- curse
 in asyndeton: 385
 homoeopathy in: 384–5
 on first malefactor: 472
 polyptoton in: 385
 wish for destruction: 467–8
- Cybele
 and Dionysus: 343, 346
 and Mysia: 343, 345
 and Pan: 342, 345
 and Rhea: 343, 346
- day
 alternates with night: 336
 ‘crucial’ day: 175
 one enough to reverse fortunes:
 175, 358
 white horses of: 336
- death *see also* Hades
 agonies of: 383
 and sleep: 383
 attacking dead, wickedness of:
 421
 better than shame: 277
 body covered: 405
 burial of, a panhellenic custom:
 512
 dead deserve justice: 508
 dead kill living: 429
 dead leave suffering to living: 416
 emotion persists after: 519
 funeral rites: 516
 invoked by sufferer: 387
 κατέχω predicated of dead: 466
 noble, beautiful: 277
 successful valued only after death:
 413, 414
 warriors retain ferocity in death:
 424
 ‘you have killed me by your
 death’: 401
- defeat, attitudes to: 148
- dew: 475
- Dionysus
 and Crete: 343, 346
 and Cybele: 343, 346
 and Nysa: 343, 346
 and Pan: 343, 346
- dogs
 and birds, eat corpses: 382,
 440
 Laconian: 140
- emotion
 anger, ‘heavy’: 150
 causes
 flight: 343, 346
 shuddering: 343, 345
 desperation: 256
 ‘where should I go?’: 257
 envy: 184, 298
 grief
 cloud of: 349
 contrast of past and present:
 319
 day and night: 408
 described in terms of feeding:
 319, 321–2
 fasting: 233
 noisy or quiet: 232
 should be private: 307
 sufferer stands or sits: 202,
 233
 in silence: 231
 sufferer wishes it on others:
 252–3
 useless: 386
 violent manifestations of
 beating breast: 324
 noise: 324
 pulling hair: 230, 324
 striking head: 230
- hope
 empty: 277
 located in
 ἦπαρ: 409
 σπλάγχνα: 275
 φρήν: 290
 persists after death: 519
- pity: 173
 felt by enemies: 407
 ‘seize’ people: 207

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- enclitic, position of: 310
- Enyalios: 194–5
- Erebus: 255
- Erectheus: 203–4
- Eriboea 302–3
 - reaction to son's death: 285, 321, 386
- Erinyes: 383–4, 385, 518–19
- Eros, winged: 343, 346
- Eurysaces, etymology of name: 304–5
- eye
 - contact: 237, 272, 273
 - fear manifested in: 180
 - witness testimony: 146
- fables: 459–60
- fortune, heritable: 297
- friends
 - abandon man in trouble: 242
 - win over friends: 234
- gods
 - addressed as φίλε, φίλη: 149
 - 'alliance' with: 171
 - and gold: 165
 - and justice: 366
 - and men, effect outcome together: 281
 - anger: 332, 365
 - apotropaic: 196–7
 - conflation of deity and image: 165
 - dancing: 344, 348
 - destroy even the strong: 271–2
 - 'divine scourge': 179
 - do all things, do things easily: 163, 330, 433
 - force conveyed by hand: 147
 - 'not without gods' help': 362–3
 - offered battle spoils: 191, 192
 - opposed to men: 256
 - presence inferred from voice: 141
 - punish 'excessively': 411
 - raise up, cast down mortals: 174–5
 - require gratitude, sacrifice: 191, 193
 - send rumours: 422
 - 'stand near' protégés: 165
 - target the great: 361
 - thoughts above thoughts of men: 360
- Hades
 - associated with night: 333
 - journey to: 341
 - referred to by euphemism: 304, 341
 - unseen: 317, 318
- hands, shaking of: 359
- hearth: 281
- Hellespont: 397–8
- Hermes
 - conveys dead to Hades: 382–3
 - πολύκοινος: 473
- Hesione, mother of Teucer: 426–7
- hiatus: 198, 199
- hybris*: 183, 200
- hymn, cletic: 341
 - includes command 'appear': 343, 346–7
- Icarus: 344, 347
- Ion of Chios: 36
- irony: 177, 191, 253, 292, 317, 333, 381–2, 387, 396, 399
- 'joy before disaster' ode: 342, 345
- justice
 - accomplished in the end: 518
 - and Erinyes: 518–19
 - contrasted with violence: 506
 - owed to dead: 508
 - trampled on: 506–7
- laughter: 161, 413
- light, and deliverance: 349
- Linus-song: 322
- madness
 - abolishes suffering: 217–18
 - and Erinyes: 156
 - and Gorgons: 270

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- and laughter: 228
 and lightning: 215
 and restlessness: 228
 and sickness: 156
 compared to storms: 242
 gradually realised by madman: 229
 indicated by unusual
 actions: 196
 breathing: 220
 language: 213
 leads to suffering: 413
 rolling eyes, erring mind: 270
 sent by god: 156
 tragic: 156
 manuscripts: 59–67
 ancient: 59–60
 γράφεται—variants in: 171, 172
 errors of (real or alleged)
 adverb replaces adverbial
 neuter plural: 201
 anticipation of later text
 displaces original: 371
 assimilation of case to
 neighbouring word: 337, 340, 353, 355, 410, 461
 asyndeton eliminated: 349
 Attic form replaces original: 408, 520
 augment wrongly added: 473
 combination of mental and
 mechanical processes: 244–5, 317, 341, 385, 456, 514
 commoner word, ending etc.
 substituted: 155, 215, 220, 231, 293, 329, 330, 361
 confusion of
 accents: 161, 167, 183, 191, 192–3, 225, 226, 237, 258–9, 263, 360, 402, 447, 474, 475
 breathings: 141, 371
 case: 148, 178, 182, 191–2, 219, 221, 230, 235, 246, 271, 277, 294, 321, 326, 351, 353, 360, 361, 367–8, 399, 400, 402, 403, 407, 466, 477, 489, 511
 comparative/superlative: 357
 gender: 209–10, 243–4, 321, 326, 428
 letters: 262; α / αι: 275; α / δ: 327; α / ου: 507; αν / αι: 303; β / μ: 321–2, 393–4; γ / λ: 210; ε / ο: 459; ει / η: 484; η / οι: 244; ζ / ξ: 344–5, 348; κ / σ: 363; κ / χ: 271; λλ / μ: 520; ν / λ: 317; ξ / σ: 269; ο / ω: 319, 489
 mood: 184, 220, 232, 272, 289, 299, 301, 354, 361, 442–3, 444–5
 number: 150, 226, 248, 284, 294, 324, 326, 334, 351, 361, 367–8, 412, 466, 489
 person: 344, 348, 412, 435, 457
 tense: 153, 158, 228, 299, 301, 437, 483
 voice: 151, 247, 435
 words: ἄγρα / ἔδρα: 397; αἶ / αἰών: 251; Αἰδης / Ἄρης: 433; αἶθων / αἶθοψ: 209; αἰσχιστος / ἐχθιστος / ἄθλιος: 439; ἄλιον / ἄλιαν: 243–4; ἄμα / ἴσως: 425; ἀνόνητα / ἀνόητα: 361, 491; ἄπερ / ἄτε: 187; ἄπ– / ἐν– / ἐπ– / ὑπ–: 228, 229, 243, 278; ἀριστεύς / ἀριστος: 500; ἄτρεστος / ἄτρεπτος: 246; αὔθις / αὔτις: 445; ἀφείς / ἐφείς: 282; βάθος / βάρος: 174; βλέπων / φρονών: 219–20; βούλημα / βούλημα: 151; γ' / δ': 268, 338; γε / με / σε: 311; γε / τε: 441, 501;

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

manuscripts (*cont.*)

δέ / τε: 337, 340, 384, 436;
 δή / δέ: 259; δῆτα / δή:
 397; δισσός / διοίς: 155;
 δορυσσήτος /
 δορυσσός: 471;
 δυσπραξία / δυσπραγία:
 361; δύστηνος / δέλαιος:
 423; ἔγωγε / ἐγὼ δέ: 168;
 ἔθ / ποθ / ἄν: 290; εἰ / ἦ,
 ᾗ: 194, 455; ἐν / εἰς: 161–2;
 εἷς / ἐκ: 325–6; ἐμπίτνων /
 ἐμπίπτων / ἐμπεσών: 155;
 ἐντός / οὗτος: 491;
 ἐπευθύνω / ἐπεντύνω:
 271; ἐπι– / ὑπο–: 145;
 ἔπραξαν / ἔπρασαν: 269;
 ἐπώμοτος / ἐνώμοτος:
 451; ἔτ / τ: 242; εὐερον /
 εὐκερων: 227; εὐπειστα /
 εὐπιστα: 183; ἐφώνεις /
 ἐφρόνεις / ἐκόμπεις: 481;
 ἔχοι / ἔχειν: 250; ἔχω /
 ἄγω: 157, 252; ἔχων /
 ἔλων / παρών: 155; ἔως /
 ὡς: 452; ἦ / ᾗ: 167, 168; ἦ
 / εἰ / ᾗν: 282; ἦδιον /
 ἦλεων: 426; ἦμῖν / ἡμην:
 338; θεᾶν / θεῶν: 397;
 θροεῖν / θρηνεῖν: 308;
 ἴσμεν / ἴδμεν: 144; κάγω /
 ἀγώ: 423; κακάζω /
 βακχάζω: 201–2; καλός /
 κενός: 277; κοῦκ / οὐκ:
 330; κρυφεῖς / κρυφθεῖς /
 κρυβεῖς: 461; λαβών /
 λαχών: 337, 382; λέγειν /
 φρονεῖν: 312; μαίμωσαν /
 μαργῶσαν / διψῶσαν:
 153; μήν / μή: 335; μικρός
 / σμικρός: 184, 454;
 ναύαρχος / ναυάρχης:
 482; ξυμ– / ἐμ–: 274;
 ξυνόντες / ζητοῦντες:
 437–8; οἶκτος / οἶτος: 400;
 ὀλέθρια / ὀλέθριον /

οὐλίον: 257; ὅπου / ὅτου:
 147; ὀρμή / ὀργή: 463; ὅτε
 / τότε: 155; οὐ / αὖ: 392;
 οὖν / αὖ: 413; οὔτε / οὐδέ:
 264; οὔνεκα / εἵνεκα: 234;
 πάθαι / τύχαι: 227; πάθος
 / βάρος: 207; πανταχῇ /
 πανταχοῦ: 514; παρ /
 γάρ: 325; πέτρος / πέτρα:
 354; πῆματι / τραύματι:
 308; πημονάν / ποιμένων:
 244–5; ποιεῖ / φύει: 329,
 330; πόνος / φόνος /
 κόπος: 157; πορεῖν /
 πονεῖν: 516; ποῦ / ποῖ:
 483; προς– / προ–: 382;
 σαυτοῦ / αὐτοῦ: 278; σὺ
 δέ / ἀλλά: 459; σφαλερός
 / χαλεπός: 184–5; τέλους
 / τάχους: 340; τοι / τοῖς:
 365; τόνδε / τόν: 447;
 τοσοῦτος / τοιοῦτος: 339,
 366, 440; τόσον / τόσον:
 196; τράπη / φύγη: 257;
 τρέπει / νέμει: 145; τῷ /
 τοι: 252; ὕστατος /
 ἔσχατος: 389; φευκτός /
 φερτός: 210; –φθήσομαι /
 –φθήσομαι: 427; φιτύσας /
 φυτεύσας: 498; φράζειν /
 λέγειν: 227; χειρῶν /
 φρενῶν: 152; χερί / φρενί:
 147; χρῆς / χρή: 514–15;
 χῶ / ᾗ: 197–8; ὦ / ἰώ:
 248; ὥστ / ὥς: 166–7
 consonant cluster simplified:
 344, 347
 construction misread,
 simplified: 155–6, 230,
 231–2, 235, 246, 275, 317,
 325, 361, 364, 403, 423,
 432, 464, 475, 501, 510,
 514, 516
 crasis removed or introduced:
 149, 369–70
 dittography: 323

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Doric forms introduced: 202–3,
325
elision omitted or introduced:
144, 201, 230, 292, 300
error Walthianus: 162
haplography: 383
Homeric/epic form
introduced: 164, 188
interpolation of lines:
157–8
intrusion of
gloss: 145
preposition: 343, 346
scholia: 301
later form introduced: 278
metrical ‘correction’: 155,
411–12
misattribution of lines: 407, 415,
453, 479, 504
pause causes error: 506
polar error: 212, 261
portmanteau line: 479
punctuated wrongly: 158, 380,
428, 513
reminiscence of earlier phrase:
399, 486, 498, 516
repetition leads to error: 255–6,
400
saut du même au même: 384
syntax simplified: 172
transposition of lines: 144
truth preserved by gloss: 182
verbs/participles confused: 424
vitium Byzantinum: 229
word/letters
copied from vicinity: 163,
248, 269
introduced: 205, 231, 234,
265, 282, 299, 303, 319,
350, 374, 380, 384, 387,
398, 405, 406, 408, 411–12,
413, 414, 429–31, 439,
448–51, 486, 517–18, 520,
521, 523–4
omitted: 159, 166, 188, 205,
253, 258, 304, 351, 354,
360, 370, 406, 409, 411,
425, 429, 440, 492
wrongly divided: 193, 287–8,
307, 365–6
wrongly ordered: 310,
524–5
mediaeval: 60–7
individual manuscripts
a: 61–2, 366
H: 178
K: 60–1
L: 60, 151, 167, scholiast: 283
A: 60
r: 62–4
medicine, and magic: 308
Menelaus
connects fear, restraint, good
order: 442
buffoon: 445
cowardly: 440
poor argumentation: 436–7
shares dwelling with brother: 152
Spartan: 437, 442, 448
thinks big: 445
messenger, messenger speech
arrives too late: 356
begins with
good news: 352
word of good omen: 352
characteristics of: 221
delimits knowledge: 227
eyewitness: 358
keeps to his brief: 370
Messenia, division of: 493–4
metre
aeolo-choriambic 315
glyconic: 190, 317
iambic metron replaces base:
208, 469, 470
anapaests
difference from lyric: 176
‘marching’: 176
paroemiac: 208
short syllable overrunning
metron: 182
transitional: 7–8, 464–5

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- metre (*cont.*)
 caesura, medial: 422
 dactylo-epitrite: 189
 dochmiacs
 and iambics: 239
 correction: 242
 hypodochmiacs: 241
 period end within sequences:
 240
 response of: 241
 enoplian: 190
 extrametrical exclamations: 355,
 423
 iambics
 and dochmiacs: 239
 bisected trimeter: 516
 ionics: 469, 470
 period-end, constraints ignored:
 420
 Porson's law: 448
 prosody: 168
 shortening: 519
 split resolution: 240, 314
 'mixing' people with troubles: 400
- narrative
 delay: 358
 repetition: 367
 told from experiencing
 focalisation: 224
- night
 alternates with day: 336
 and Hades: 333
 backdrop to treachery: 223
 black horses of: 336
noblesse oblige: 446
- nouns, pronouns, adjectives
 abstract noun, predicated of
 person: 499
 adjectives distributed equally: 178
- case
 attraction of: 273, 303, 438
 accusative
 and infinitive, exclamatory:
 259, 260
 cognate: 224, 229, 447
 double: 143
 expresses content of shout:
 159
 feminine adjective denoting
 time: 205
 governed by: another noun:
 154; ἀρέσκω: 309; ἔζομαι:
 214; ἐξίσταμαι: 162;
 ἐπιβαίνω: 180; ξυνῆλθον:
 281; verb of rejoicing: 179
 internal / 'in apposition to
 sentence': 300–1, 413, 475
 marks duration: 360
 of space travelled: 146
 of respect: 412
 twin: 449
 with ἀλγέω: 369
- dative
 agent / judgment: 268
 causal: 193, 204, 516
 ἔρποντι φωνεῖς: 294, 311
 –εσσι: 249
 ethic: 235
 instrumental: 156, 355
 limitative: 255
 locative: 198, 290
 modal: 151, 156
 possessive: 287
 with: ἐπί: 181; μεθίημι: 248;
 παρά: 320, 407
- genitive
 ablative: 152, 494
 absolute: 486
 after negative compound
 adjective: 233
 constituent: 185
 defining: 154, 465, 473
 denotes object of report: 209
 denotes paternity: 190
 objective: 203, 457
 of agent: 234
 of cause: 452
 of place: 491
 of quality: 424
 of respect: 363
 of separation: 373, 409–10

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- of thing cheated: 193
- of time: 143, 460
- partitive: 167, 213, 231, 253, 333, 344, 347–8, 357
- possessive: 154
- replace original cognate
 - accusative: 399
- twin: 154
- with: ἦκω and adverb: 326;
 - πελάζω: 349; πρέπον: 292; πρὸς: 232
- nominative
 - adjective, with vocative
 - noun: 326–7
 - of exclamation: 248
 - participle with δηλόω: 275
 - used for vocative: 302
- vocative
 - ἄνθρωπε: 369–70
 - germinated in cultic context: 343, 346
 - γύναι: 226
 - οὗτος: 158
 - παῖ: 236
 - ‘points a moral’: 172
 - predicative: 343, 347
 - φίλε, φίλη: 149
 - φίλοι: 232
 - Ζεῦ πάτερ: 253
- gender
 - neuter
 - adverbial: 201
 - of persons: 428
 - predicate: 308, 399
- incorporated into relative clause: 219
- number
 - singular, for plural: 230
 - plural, for singular: 211, 236
- Nysa, and Dionysus: 343, 346
- oath: 330
 - sworn by Helen’s suitors: 450, 451
- Odysseus
 - blamed by Tecmessa: 412
 - close to Agamemnon: 506
- conciliatory: 41, 48, 137
- denied participation in Ajax’s
 - burial: 515
- hated by Ajax: 161
- ‘much-enduring’: 412
- pities Ajax: 173
- praises Ajax: 507
- resolves impasse: 502–3
- rhetorical skill: 183
- scheming: 139
- sees all things: 251
- son of Sisyphus?: 197, 519
- supported by Athena: 139
- old people
 - angry: 427
- conciliators: 355
- grey hair: 324
- too old to learn: 312
- Olympus: 397, 518
- orphans: 286–7, 305
- orthography etc.
 - ἁδάματος: 271
 - ἠδών: 323
 - Αἴας: 164
 - αἰεῖ: 316
 - ἄκίζομαι: 157
 - ἄμαχθην: 403, 404
 - ἀναύδητος: 350–1
 - ἀνῆρ: 141
 - ἀνοιμωκτεῖ: 480
 - ἀντήλιος: 373
 - ἀνύω: 317
 - ἄξας: 216
 - ἄπαυστος: 471
 - ἄσσω / αἴσσω: 146
 - ἄσφάδαστος: 383
 - ἄφαρκτος: 404
 - βασιλῆς: 197
 - γέλων / γέλωτα: 252
 - δορί: 287
 - δοῦρι–: 206
 - δωρεά: 432
 - ἐγκεκλημένος: 491
 - εἶέν: 167
 - εἶργω: 359–60
 - εἶσω / ἔσω: 212

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

orthography etc. (*cont.*)

ἐκεῖνος: 500
 ἐλαφρόβολος: 193
 ἐμπα(ς): 173, 301
 ἐμπί(τ)νω: 155
 ἐνάλιος: 302
 ἐρειφθεῖς: 230
 Ἐρινύς: 384
 ἔρκειος: 169
 ἔταιρεία: 339
 ἐχθαρτέος: 338–9
 –η / –ει: 159
 ἡμέριος: 205–6
 ἦμιν: 207
 ἡύρεθην: 172
 θακῶ: 168
 κακάζω: 202
 κνάπτω: 432
 Κνωσσός: 346–7
 λεύσσω: 217
 μετανεγνώσθην: 351
 μηχανή: 195
 μούστί: 479
 ξυνείρξετε: 311–12
 οἰκτίρω: 173
 οἶχωκα: 400
 ὁμοιος: 298
 ὀνησις: 256
 ὄτοβος: 474
 πλευρά: 485
 –πληκτος: 211, 316
 ποιέω: 463, 519
 πόλη: 386
 πυκινός: 475
 ῥίπτω: 212–13
 σεσώμενος: 341
 σύμμεικτα: 154
 τᾶν: 272
 τείσω: 170
 φής: 369
 ὥμοι: 210

Pan

and Apollo: 344, 347
 and Cybele: 342, 345
 and Cyllene, Arcadia: 344, 347

and dancing: 344–5, 348
 and Dionysus: 343, 346
 maritime associations: 343–4,
 347

participle

linked with prepositional phrase:
 192
 non-articular, denotes individual:
 219

Periclean citizenship law: 487

Phrygians

barbarians: 496
 compatriots of Atridae: 495
 equivalent of Trojans: 438

Pius, grammarian: 181, 259,
 260

prayer

ἄποπομπή: 153
da quia dedisti: 138–9, 147
 ‘if you can’: 234
 ‘spare us’: 385

Procne: 322–3

punctuation: 185–6, 211, 216, 237,
 286, 292

questions

as exclamations: 470
 deliberative: 272
 rhetorical: 337
 third-person instead of first: 257
 urgent: 393

rhetorical attacks

on foreign speech: 487
 on speaker’s mother: 481,
 499

on social background: 482

river, provides water: 261

rulers, should be heeded: 509

Salamis: 177–8

tranquil: 315

Salaminioi: 477

seasons, alternation of: 335

secondary tradition: 65–6, 68, 353,
 509, 510

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- silence
 - a κόσμος: 226
 - befits women: 226
 - ominous: 233
 - Sisyphus: 197, 204
 - slaves, punishment of:
 - 168–9
 - Sleep
 - and death: 383
 - power of: 337
 - Sophocles
 - Ajax in: 34–5
 - antilabe*, use of: 4–7
 - birth, death: 1
 - dates of plays: 2–4
 - emphasis on place: 388
 - first performance: 1–2
 - gods on stage in: 136
 - interlinear hiatus, use of: 4–7
 - ‘Sophoclean heroes’: 42–4
 - third actor, use of: 8–9
 - titles of plays: 135
 - trilogies, connected in?: 35
 - Sophocles, *Ajax*
 - audience reaction: 25
 - date: 1–11
 - epinician allusions?: 179
 - hero cult in: 46–51
 - Homeric/epic forms/allusions:
 - 37, 41, 45, 177, 181, 182,
 - 186, 200, 249, 254, 255,
 - 262–3, 272, 273–4, 280,
 - 282–3, 284, 285, 287, 288,
 - 295, 296, 297, 300, 301,
 - 349, 354–5, 357, 361–2,
 - 372, 386, 405, 408, 420,
 - 431, 465, 490–1, 492, 493,
 - 494, 499–500, 501, 504,
 - 515, 519, 523
 - hypothesis: 135
 - myth: 26–41, 328
 - parodos: 7
 - performance context: 11
 - politics: 57–9
 - production
 - change of scene: 12–20
 - disputed points: 293–4, 312–13,
 - 374–5, 376–9, 417–18
 - double entry: 478–9
 - entrances and exits: 20–2
 - of prologue: 137–8
 - part division: 22–5
 - setting: 11–12
 - two doors in skene?: 19
 - structure: 53–4
 - themes
 - fathers and sons: 56–7, 266,
 - 284–5, 296, 297, 298, 300,
 - 306
 - friends and enemies: 55–6, 338,
 - 505
 - hunting and searching: 54–5,
 - 136–7, 138, 139–40, 292,
 - 389–90
 - third actor in: 8–9
 - title: 135
 - trilogy, part of connected?: 35–6
 - unity: 51–7
- Sparta
- and Menelaus: 437, 442
 - νόμος: 442
 - σωφροσύνη: 442
- speaking one’s mind: 486, 487
- speech: 280
- ends with antithesis: 175
 - takes up entire scene: 328
 - τις-Rede: 282–3, 284
- stagecraft
- ekkyklema: 241
 - θεολογείον: 138
 - gesture: 263
 - introduction of skene building: 2
 - μηχανή: 138
 - off-stage cries: 235
 - σκηνογραφία: 13
- stoning: 215, 354
- style
- adjective used for genitive: 150
 - agon*: 434, 478
 - alliteration: 291
 - anacoluthon: 353
 - anadiplosis: 349

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- style (*cont.*)
 anaphora: 179, 285
 antilabe: 419
 antithesis: 329, 330, 444
 aposiopesis: 252, 357
 ascending tricolon etc.: 227, 246,
 400, 486
 assonance: 303
 asyndeton: 156, 171, 185, 425
 explanatory: 275, 335, 458
 in curses: 385
 in prayers: 382
 suggests impatience, haste: 309,
 374
 enallage: 140, 191, 192, 214, 389
 enjambment: 245, 273
 epic forms: 196
 foreshadowing: 172
 hyperbaton, word order: 225, 231,
 243, 366
 hypophora: 264–5, 274
 imagery
 metaphor: 144, 147, 156,
 173–4 (shadow), 185
 (tower), 190 (mother),
 204–5, 242 (storm), 215
 (rowing), 275, 276 (board
 game?), 297 (horse
 taming), 309 (whetstone),
 331 (ironworking), 339
 (harbour), 343–4, 347
 (shooting), 368 (shaving),
 380 (whetstone), 410
 (yoke), 418 (arrow), 432
 (carding), 433
 (blacksmiths), 438
 (quenching), 443–4 (ship),
 485 (ox), 504 (knots)
 simile: 140, 180 (doves),
 186–7 (birds), 420 (lion)
 simile shifts into metaphor:
 187
 juxtaposition: 311, 441, 455, 499
 litotes: 286, 454
 opposition of terms: 299
 oxymoron: 297, 334
 paradox: 381
 parataxis: 484–5
 pauses: 237
 periphrasis: 141, 143, 145, 181–2,
 268, 289, 293, 357, 388
 personification: 190, 333, 403, 489
 pleonasm: 360, 401, 411, 422,
 511–12
 polar opposition: 483
 polyptoton: 155, 218, 245, 274,
 289, 299–300, 320, 360,
 391, 407, 434, 456, 457,
 500
 proverbial: 334, 444, 463, 513
 register
 brusque: 480
 bureaucratic: 287
 colloquial: 222, 225, 228, 239,
 393, 450, 451, 458, 518, 521
 avoided: 277, 449, 463
 contemptuous: 462
 elevated: 283–4, 392, 422, 519
 everyday combined with
 dignified: 359
 formal: 302
 low: 453–4
 military: 291
 ornate: 324
 plain: 222
 sarcastic: 425, 447, 483
 scornful: 454
 repetition: 165, 169, 185, 191, 198,
 211, 225, 233, 240, 242,
 246, 247, 254, 255, 261,
 317, 320, 330, 338, 386–7,
 404, 408, 422, 426, 447,
 455, 475
 rhyme: 373, 444
 song and speech: 238, 264
 stichomythia: 309, 367, 453
 synaesthesia: 368
 tautology: 169, 349, 388
 understatement: 268, 414
 variation: 388, 394
 word order: 153, 247, 306
 suicide, attitudes to: 275

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Sun
 as messenger: 386
 chariot of: 336, 386
 final farewell to: 388
- Sunium: 476–8
- suppliant, supplication
 appeals by something φίλον:
 310
 sitting: 467
- symposium
 and the αὐλός: 474
 contrasted with war: 474
 garlands round drinkers' heads:
 474
- syntax
 antagonistic: 362, 464
 compression: 231
 διὰ μέσου construction: 158
 ellipse: 290, 374
 independence of, marks
 self-absorption: 419–20
 indirect, for politeness: 290
 καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος construction:
 230
 sense construction: 244, 420
- Tecmessa
 directness: 292
 end of spoken part: 416
 grief of: 410
 leads mourning for Ajax: 394–5
 on vase: 30
 parents: 206
 removes cloak, veil: 405
 rhetorically competent: 224,
 278–80, 281, 284, 288
 silent re-entry: 466
 'spear-won bride': 206, 281
 wise, quick-witted: 218, 373
- Telamon
 banishes Teucer: 34, 35–6, 417
 sacks Troy, wins Hesione:
 266–7
- Teucer
 accompanies Ajax: 26
 accuses Atridae of cheating: 457
 aggression: 449–51
 exile: 427
 fights alongside Ajax: 494
 founds Salamis in Cyprus:
 34
 illegitimate: 426
 initial impression favourable:
 416–17
 lament over Ajax's body: 417
 prevents Odysseus' participation
 in Ajax's burial: 515
 returns to Salamis, banished by
 Telamon: 34, 35–6
 rhetorical ability: 446, 450, 451,
 453, 457, 459–60, 488–9,
 516
 son of Hesione: 426–7, 499
 takes over from Tecmessa:
 416–17
- time
 affects all: 329
 causes decay: 350
 engenders: 329
 long: 329
 reveals: 329
 Timotheus of Miletus: 36, 40
 Triclinius: 66–7
 trumpet: 142–3, 225
 twice and thrice: 265
- verbs
 desiderative: 233
 mood
 imperative
 addressed to world at large:
 431
 negative introduces strong
 command: 159–60, 247
 present: 159
 with μή δῆτα: 169
 with μηδ' αὐτως: 159
 with ὥ: 165
 infinitive
 epexegetic: 171, 232, 474
 subject of first becomes
 object of second: 297

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- optative
 - after optative of wish: 478
 - future: 231
 - potential: 196, 277
 - states future possibility: 272
 - with ἔν, consenting: 163
- subjunctive
 - deliberative, with future: 257, 406
 - without ἔν: 361
- tense
 - aorist
 - expresses termination: 284
 - infinitive, of future time: 444
 - instantaneous: 167, 292–3
 - vividly represents near-event: 455
 - future
 - after ὅπως: 344, 347
 - emphatic: 459
 - final-consecutive: 275
 - in wishes: 339
 - middle with passive sense: 463
 - with deliberative subjunctive: 257, 406
 - future perfect: 307, 514
 - perfect
 - marks completeness: 400
 - πεφóβηται: 180
 - present
 - historic: 153
 - timeless, in participles: 484
- voice
 - middle, where active expected: 330
 - subordinate, omitted: 147
 - θην suffix with middle sense: 144
 - unique middles: 501, 515–16
- walking on tiptoe: 481
- war, contrasted with symposium: 474
- washing, means of purification: 332
- watch-fires: 223–4
- wealth
 - depth of: 174
 - source of status, τιμή: 174, 288
- white, horses: 336
- wind
 - calms sea: 336
 - provides nourishment: 300
 - urges on fire: 200–1
- women
 - prone to pity: 308
 - reconciled by sex: 281, 282
 - remind man of sexual favours: 289
 - should remain silent: 226
- young people, free from care: 298
- Zeus
 - Ajax's ancestor: 253
 - and justice, Erinyes: 519
 - ἔφέστιος: 281
 - first among gods: 381
 - wields thunderbolt: 259–60

INDEX OF GREEK

- ἄ δῆ: 434
 ἄγαν: 243, 411–12
 ἄγαν ὑπερ-: 411
 ἀγγέλλομαι: 515–16
 ἀγέλη: 187, 188
 ἀγχίαιλος: 178
 ἄγω: 211, 252
 ἦξα: 270
 ἀγωνάρχης: 304
 ἀγωνιος: 200
 ἀδόματος: 271
 ἀεξ-: 210
 αἰανής: 336
 αἰδηλος: 317–18
 αἰδώς: 237
 αἶθω: 224
 αἶθων: 209
 αἰμύλος: 254
 αἰόλος: 429
 αἶρω: 160, 214, 295
 αἰστώ: 287
 αἰχμαλωτίς: 159
 αἰών: 327
 ἄκρος: 212, 223
 ἁλάομαι: 144
 ἁλάστωρ: 248
 ἁλγέω: 369
 ἁλέξω: 332–3
 ἁλημα: 252
 ἁλιάδης: 397
 ἁλίρροθος: 260
 ἁλις: 521
 ἁλλά: 199, 218, 274, 291, 386–7, 514
 ἁλλά . . . γάρ: 186
 ἁλλ' ἄνα: 199
 ἁλλ' οὐδὲ μὲν δῆ: 393
 ἁλλ' οὖν: 292
 ἁλλος: 288
 ἅλμα κουφιεῖν: 494
 ἁμενηνός: 399
 ἁμέριμνος: 475
 ἅμυγμα: 324
 ἁμφί: 229, 382
 ἁμφίπυρος: 522
 ἁνά: 471–2
 ἀναγκαῖα τύχη: 280
 ἀνάγω: 175
 ἀναιρέω: 212
 ἀναλίσκω: 435
 ἀνασπάω: 228
 ἄναυδος: 411
 ἀνήκεστος: 154
 ἀνήρ: 156, 160–1, 209, 301–2
 ἄνθρωπε: 369–70, 463
 ἀνίημι: 476
 ἄνολβος: 464
 ἀντακούω: 459
 ἀντήλιος: 373
 ἀντί: 428
 ἀντίος: 494
 ἀνύω: 317
 ἄξιόω: 451
 ἀπαλέξασθαι: 186
 ἀπείργω: 264
 ἀπειρέσιος: 408
 ἀπο-: 159
 ἀποβλάπτω: 409–10
 ἀπορρέω: 290
 ἀπότροπος: 317
 ἀποψύχω: 432
 ἀπρίξ: 230–1
 ἀπύω: 398
 ἄρα: 211, 219, 408
 ἄρα: 220, 356, 403, 419
 ἀράσσω: 353
 ἀργίπους: 212
 ἄρδην: 492
 ἀριστερός: 196
 ἄρκέω: 268
 ἄρμοϊ: 214
 ἄρτιος: 410
 ἄσκοπον: 143
 ἀσπιστήρ: 302
 ἄσσω: 149–50

INDEX OF GREEK

- ἀτάλλω: 300
 ἀτάομαι: 219
 ἄτη: 230, 327
 ἀτιμάω: 456
 ἄτρυτος: 369
 αὔ: 392
 αὖθις . . . πάλιν: 229
 αὐλός: 474
 αὐτο-: 343, 347, 385
 αὐτός: 447
 αὐτόχειρ: 155
 αὐτως ὅπωςπερ: 468
 ἄφοβος: 246
 ἄφορρος: 247

 βάθρον: 178
 βάλλω, βολαί: 393
 βάνηστος: 454
 βάπτω: 165
 βαρύψυχος: 232
 βάσιν κυκλέω: 143
 βαστάζω: 382
 -βαφής: 207
 βόσκω: 300, 319
 βοτόν: 211
 -βριθής: 411
 βρυχάω: 233
 -βρώς: 380

 γάρ: 162, 167, 196, 221, 223, 289-90, 455, 506
 γε: 161, 275, 392, 441
 emphatic: 311, 338
 γε μέντοι: 278
 γε τοι: 292
 γενναῖος: 409
 γεννάω: 443
 γένος: 256, 367-8
 γεύομαι: 385
 γυμνός: 273
 γύναι: 226

 -δαίκτης: 207
 δαίμων: 284
 δάιος: 367
 δάκνω: 453

 δαρός: 261
 δέ: 171, 237
 δ' οὖν: 170
 δεῖ: 299
 δείκνυμι: 302
 δεινός: 336-7
 δεινάζω, δέννος: 213
 δέσποινα: 149
 δεύω: 250
 δῆ: 253
 δῆλον: 403
 δηλόω, δῆλος: 146, 275
 δημότης: 441
 δῆτα: 150
 διά: 306
 διαπεραιόω: 354
 διάστροφος: 269-70
 διαφέρομαι: 286
 διαφαιβάω: 235
 δίκη, δίκαιος: 296
 δικρατής: 215
 διογενής: 165
 δῖος: 360
 δίπαλτος: 259-60
 δις καὶ τρίς: 265
 διςσάρχης: 254
 δίχα: 362
 δόλος: 152
 δορυσόητος: 471
 δυσθεράπευτος: 317, 318
 δύσμορος: 320
 δυσπετής: 435
 δυσπραξία, -γία: 361
 δύστηνος: 320, 472
 δυστράπελος: 405
 δυσφόρος: 153
 δωρέω: 431-2

 ἐγχος: 165
 ἐγώ, ἐγωγε: 168
 ἐδώλια: 492
 εἰ: 296
 εἶδον: 460
 εἶέν: 167
 εἵπερ: 357
 εἵπερ . . . γε: 162

INDEX OF GREEK

- εἶργω: 359–60
 εἷς: 371, 471
 εἷς: 326
 εἶσασι: 303
 εἶτα: 446, 462–3
 ἐκ: 220
 ἐκ τῶνδε: 293
 ἐκβάλλω: 440
 ἐκλύω: 479
 ἐκπλήσσω: 146
 ἐκπνέω: 429, 432
 ἕκτα: 211
 ἐκτείνω χρόνον: 521
 ἐκτός: 247
 ἐκφέρω: 140
 ἐλαύνομαι: 220
 ἐλαφάβολος: 193
 ἔλιξ: 249
 ἐλίσσω: 244
 ἔλλος: 499
 ἐλπίζω: 317
 ἔλωρ: 382
 ἐμβάλλω: 271
 ἐμπίπτω βάσιν: 150
 ἐμπληκτος: 512
 ἐμπολάω: 419
 ἐν: 458, 461
 ἐν δέ: 337
 ἐν σοί: 288
 ἐν σοι φράσω: 458
 ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς: 291
 ἐν ὑμῖν: 150
 ἐν χρῶ: 368
 ἐνευρίσκω: 461
 ἐνθάδε: 513, 514
 ἐνστάτης: 168
 ἐντροφος: 321
 ἐξ: 351
 ἐξαλλάσσω: 275, 277
 εἰοιγμεν: 483
 ἐπάγω: 471, 498
 ἐπαρκέω: 244
 ἔπαυλος: 317
 ἔπειτα: 222
 ἔπειτα . . . ἔπειδή: 156–7
 ἔπεστι: 476
 ἐπί: 181, 498
 ἐπ' ἐξειργασμένοις: 250
 ἐπιβαίνω: 180
 ἐπιβρόντητος: 518
 ἐπιπλήσσω: 224–5
 ἐπισκῆπτω: 302
 ἐπισκοπέω: 387
 ἐπισπάω: 363, 391–2
 ἐπίτριπτος: 168
 ἐπώνυμος: 305–6
 ἔργα χερσῶν: 320
 ἐρέσσω: 215
 ἔρξα: 403
 ἔρπω: 184
 ἔρύω: 354
 ἔρω: 475
 ἐς: *see* εἷς
 ἔσθ' ὅτε . . . ἔσθ' ὅτε: 155
 ἔσπερος: 393
 εὐάνεμος: 201
 εὐδαίμων: 316
 εὐθύνομαι: 159
 εὐθύς ἐκ: 366
 εὐνομία: 349–50
 εὖρις, εὕρινος: 140
 εὐρώεις: 465–6
 εὐφρων: 344, 347–8
 ἔφεδρος: 318
 ἐφίεμαι: 170
 ἐχθοδοπός: 408
 ἔχω: 155, 178, 184, 204, 219,
 466
 ζαμενής: 180
 ζυγόν: 214
 ἦ: 167, 168, 481
 ἦ καί: 149
 ἦ που: 191
 ἦδη ποτε: 460
 ἦδιστος: 168, 299
 ἦλυθον: 211
 ἡμέρα: 321
 ἡμέριος: 205
 ἡμος: 409
 ἡσάομαι: 484

INDEX OF GREEK

- θαῤσον: 308
 θερίζω: 213
 θερμαίνω: 277
 θούριος: 207, 319
 θυμός: 412
 θωύσσω: 230
- ἰάπτω: 283, 343–4, 347
 ἰαύω: 474
 ἰδού, ἰδοῦ: 392
 ἱερός: 478
 ἦμι: 323
 ἦθι: 423
 ἦλη: 522
 ἵππομανής: 181
 ἵππονώμας: 211
 ἰού: 355–6
 ἰώ: 236, 343, 346
- καθίσταμαι: 230
 καθυβρίζω: 183
 καί: 149, 153, 181, 222, 237–8, 273,
 289, 290, 405, 494–5
 καὶ γάρ: 330
 καὶ . . . γε: 515
 καὶ δὴ: 152, 294
 καὶ μὴν: 291, 293, 370, 479
 καιρός: 147, 149, 172
 καίτοι: 184, 387
 κακανδρία: 427
 κακόθρους: 180
 κακός: 156
 καλλιστεῖον: 267
 καλός: 458
 κάλυμμα: 213–14
 καλῶ: 383
 καλῶς λέγω: 165
 κάπετος: 465
 κατά: 229
 καθ ἡμᾶς: 520
 καταξαίνω: 354
 κατάστασις: 484
 κατεναρίζω: 145
 κατέχω: 181, 466
 κατηγορέω: 403
- καχάζω: 201
 κεῖται: 205, 409
 κελαινώπης: 412
 κενός: 420–1
 κεύθω: 325
 κίναδος: 168
 κλεινός: 315, 389
 κλέπτω: 197
 κληροῦχος: 285–6
 κλίνω: 175
 κλυτός: 249
 –κμής: 233
 κνάπτω: 432
 κοιμίζω, κοιμάω: 337
 κόσμος: 448
 κράζω: 483
 κρείσσων: 325
 κρίνω: 268
 κτύπος, –κτυπος: 344, 347
 κυβερνάω: 147
 κυδάζω: 353
 κυκλέω: 243
 κυκλός: 336
 κυνέη: 494
 κύριος: 355
 κώδων: 142
 κωκυτός: 386
- λαβών: 224
 Λαέρτης etc.: 139
 λαθίπονος: 350
 λαμβάνω: 498
 λαμπτήρ: 223
 λέγω: 168, 303
 λέγω σοι: 445
 λειμών: 181–2
 λείπομαι: 484
 λευκός: 321
 λεώς: 302
 λιγύς, λιγυρός: 213
- μα: 252
 μαιμάω: 152
 μαίομαι: 224
 μακραίω: 199

INDEX OF GREEK

- μακρός: 174
 of βίος: 275, 276
 μάλιστα: 281
 μαστιξ: 213, 486
 μάτην: 325
 μέγα φρονεῖν: 253
 μέλεος: 320
 μέλος: 418
 μέν: 139, 161
 μέν . . . τε: 321
 μενοινάω: 237
 μέντ' αὖν: 163
 μέντοι: 163, 412
 μετρέω, μετρέομαι: 140
 μή: 194, 198, 247
 μηδεῖς: 481–2
 μῆνις: 332
 μνήμη: 288
 μόλις: 229–30
 μομφήν ἔχω: 195
 μόνος: 146, 274, 492
 μόρος: 321
 μυχός: 303, 304
 μών: 370

 ναίω: 315–16
 νάπος, νάπη: 400
 νέμω: 145
 νιφοστιβής: 335–6
 νόμιζε: 282

 ξαίνω: 354
 ξύν, ξυν–: *see* σύν, συν–
 ξυνός: 195

 ὁ, ἡ, τό: 231, 275, 276, 353, 354, 454, 471
 ὅδε: 161, 167, 267
 οἱ ἕω: 372, 373
 οἱ ἐν τέλει: 509
 οἰκεῖος: 217
 οἰκήτωρ: 256
 οἶμοι: 243
 οἶο–: 319
 οἶος: 247

 οἰχνέω: 301
 οἴχομαι: 423
 ὀλός: 448
 ὁμευνέτις: 283–4
 ὀμιλία: 392
 ὄμμα: 186, 198, 419, 424
 ὄμως: 142
 ὀξύς: 422
 ὀπτήρ: 146
 ὀρθόομαι: 185
 ὀρθός: 243
 ὀρφανισταί: 286–7
 ὄς: 268, 428
 ὅσον τάχος: 420
 ὅστις: 194, 267
 οὐδεῖς: 481–2
 οὐδέν ἔργον: 141
 οὐκ οὔν: 161, 436
 οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα: 275
 οὐλιος, ὀλοός: 257
 οὖν: 145
 οὐποτε: 195
 οὐπω: 328
 οὐράνιος: 200
 οὔτος: 158, 435
 οὔτως: 461, 475

 πακτώω: 307–8
 πάλαι: 236
 παλαιός: 316
 παμπήδην: 405
 παν–: 251
 πάννουχος, –ιος: 408
 πάντα: 404
 παντί σθένει: 268
 παντοία τέχνη: 359
 παπταίνω: 141
 παρά: 275, 276, 407
 παραλλάξ: 445
 παραπράσσω: 217
 πάραυλος: 15, 16, 400
 πάρεστι: 426
 παρευθύνω: 440–1
 παρήμι: 356
 παρίσταμαι: 165

INDEX OF GREEK

- παρών: 236, 356
 παταγέω: 186
 παῦσαι: 510
 πελάζω: 349
 περί: 382, 409
 περισκελής: 330
 –πετής: 403, 404
 πέτρος, πέτρα: 354
 πεφόβημαι: 180
 πηδάω: 146
 πικρός: 512
 πίνος: 252
 –πλαγκτός: 344, 347
 πλάζω, πλάζομαι: 398
 πλάσσω: 182
 πλατύς: 485
 πλευροκοπέω: 212
 πλέω: 450, 451
 πληγή Διός: 179
 πλήσσω: 210–11
 ποῖον;: 357
 πολυκοινός: 473
 πολύπρονος: 326
 πόνος: 473
 πόροι: 260
 πόρπαξ: 306–7
 ποτε: 199–200, 232, 460
 ποτί: 200
 που: 281
 ποῦ: 447
 πούς: 247, 493
 πρᾶγος: 143
 πρᾶξις: 369
 πράσσω: 269
 πρέπον: 292
 πρίασθαι: 275, 277
 πρίω: 432
 προδιδάσκω: 185
 προσέστην: 373
 πρόκειμαι: 263
 προλείπω: 285
 προπάτωρ: 248
 πρὸς: 165–6, 232
 πρὸς ἔργον: 171
 πρὸς ταῦτα: 415–16
 πρόσκειμαι: 259
 πρόσοψις: 158
 προσπέτομαι: 221
 προστρόπαιος: 467
 πρόσω: 355
 προφωνῶ: 445
 πρῶτος εὐρέτης: 472
 πτηνός: 180, 187
 πτήσσω: 188
 πυκάζω: 308
 πῶλος, πωλοδομνεῖν: 297
 πῶς ἄν: 253, 254
 πῶς γάρ;: 220
 πῶς γάρ οὐ;: 426
 ῥα: 190
 ῥίζα: 468
 ῥίς: 406
 ῥυτήρ: 213
 σακεσφόρος: 143
 σβέννυμι: 438
 σέβω: 334
 σεύω: 226
 σημαίνομαι: 146
 σκηνή: 139
 σκότος: 255
 σπείρω: 424
 σπλάγχνα: 275
 στέγη: 169
 στένω: 337
 στέργω: 365
 στερεός, στερεόφρων: 408
 στέφω: 165
 στηρίζομαι: 199
 στιβέω: 393
 –στιβής: 335–6
 στόμα: 331, 449
 συμβαλεῖν ἔπη: 504–5
 συμφορά: 158
 σύν: 413
 σύν θεῷ: 362, 365
 συν–: 245, 281, 421
 συναλλαγαί: 355
 συναλλάσσω: 281–2
 συναρπάζω: 142
 σύναυλος: 318

INDEX OF GREEK

- συνηρετῆιν: 505–6
 συνών: 236
 σύριγξ: 523
 σφαγεύς: 380
 σχέτλιος: 398–9
 σώζομαι: 341
 σῶμα: 360
 σωφροσύνη: 337

 τάρχαϊον: 496
 ταφαί: 445
 τε: 154
 τ' οὖν . . . τε: 147
 τελεῖν: 291
 τι: 274, 357
 τί δῆτα;: 293
 τί δρῶς;: 168
 τί μήν;: 335
 τί οὖν (δῆ);: 393
 τί χρήμα;: 225
 τίθημι: 304
 τις
 collective: 261, 414, 489
 intensifying: 145, 220
 menacing: 458
 omitted: 184
 τοι: 162, 209, 218, 272
 τοί (= οἱ): 521–2
 τοιγάρ: 334
 τοιγαροῦν: 281
 τοῖος: 214–15
 τόσος: 220
 τοσόσδε: 363
 τότε: 330–1
 τοῦργον: 243
 τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ: 335
 τρανής: 144
 τρέπω: 145
 τρέφω: 284, 300, 455
 τρίτος: 467
 τῶς: 385

 ὕβρις: 183
 ὕμνῶ: 225
 ὑπαρχος: 449
 ὑπασπίδιον: 522

 ὑπερμαχέω: 508
 ὑπερμέγα: 340
 ὑπό: 216, 286, 485
 ὑπο–: 233
 ὑποβάλλομαι: 197
 ὑποσπανίζω: 356
 ὑποτείνω: 217

 φαέθων: 408
 φάεννος: 255
 φάος: 255
 φέρω εἰς: 371
 φθέγγμα: 142
 φθείρω: 508
 φθίνομαι: 181
 φίλε, φίλη: 149
 φίλτατος: 142
 φλέγω: 200
 φοιτάω: 156
 φόνος: 154–5
 φορβή: 440
 φρήν: 196
 φρενοβόρως: 321–2
 φρονέω: 162, 299
 φυλάσσω: 292, 468

 χαῖρε: 389
 χαίρειν σε κελεύω: 169
 χαλκοθώραξ: 195
 χάρις: 288, 289, 489, 510
 χάσκω: 480
 χειμών: 204
 χείριος: 282
 χθόνιος: 204
 χλωρός: 440
 χραίνω: 150
 χρήσιμος: 260
 χρηστήριον: 207–8
 χρῶ: 368

 ψάμαθος: 440
 ψεύδω, ψεύδομαι: 517
 ψίθυρος: 182
 ψόφος: 452

 ᾧ: 165, 418

INDEX OF GREEK

ὦ / ὦ: 473

ὠδίνω: 370–1

ὠθέω: 484

ὠκύαλος: 349

ὦρα: 214

ὥς: 149, 151, 166–7, 181, 221, 233

ὥς ἐμοί: 255

ὥσπερ οὔν: 422

ὥστε: 166–7, 228

ὥστε καί: 505